

CITY OF DUBLIN GENERAL PLAN
HOUSING ELEMENT

A D O P T E D B Y:

THE CITY COUNCIL
FEBRUARY 11, 1985

R E V I S E D B Y:

THE CITY COUNCIL
JUNE 11, 1990

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

MAR 11 1993

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Housing Element is a revision of Volume 6
of the General Plan as adopted by the
City Council on February 11, 1985



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C124907218>

6.0 HOUSING ELEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
6.1 ASSESSMENT AND INVENTORY	
6.1.1 POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT TRENDS AND HOUSING NEEDS	1
6.1.2 HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS	10
6.1.3 INVENTORY OF LAND SUITABLE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	22
6.1.4 GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS	27
6.1.5 NON-GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS	31
6.1.6 SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS	34
6.1.7 OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION	39
6.2 HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS THAT ARE ELIGIBLE TO CHANGE TO NON LOW-INCOME HOUSING USES	40
6.3 GOALS, QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS	42
6.4 CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS	61
6.5 DESCRIPTION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION EFFORTS	62
6.6 EVALUATION OF 1985 HOUSING ELEMENT	63

APPENDIX A - REFERENCES

APPENDIX B - POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD AND EMPLOYMENT TABLES

APPENDIX C - SITES FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT MAP

APPENDIX D - RECENT RESIDENTIAL PROJECT MAP

6.0 HOUSING ELEMENT

Section 65583 of the State Government Code requires that the Housing Element consist of an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement and development of housing. It must identify adequate sites for housing, including rental housing, factory-built housing and mobile homes. Finally, it must make adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.

6.1 ASSESSMENT AND INVENTORY [65583(a)]

The needs analysis consists of an assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to meeting those needs, including the following:

- 1) population and employment trends and housing needs;
- 2) household characteristics;
- 3) inventory of land suitable for residential development;
- 4) governmental constraints;
- 5) non-governmental constraints;
- 6) special housing needs; and
- 7) opportunities for energy conservation.

6.1.1 POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT TRENDS AND HOUSING NEEDS [65583(a)(1)]

This section consists of an analysis of population and employment trends, documentation of projections and a quantification of Dublin's existing and projected housing needs for all income levels. This analysis includes the entire area within the extended planning area of the City of Dublin. The existing and projected needs include Dublin's share of the regional housing need.

Except where noted otherwise, the information contained in this section was obtained from Projections '90 and Housing Needs Determinations by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG, 1989). Where information is available, Dublin statistics and projections are compared to regional statistics and projections.

POPULATION TRENDS

Existing Population and Short Term Projections (1990 - 1995)

The current population of Dublin is estimated to be approximately 25,500 persons (ABAG, 1989). Between 1980 and 1990, Dublin's population increased by 10,201 persons, or a 67% increase (an annual increase of 1,020 persons). The population of Alameda County increased by 166,621 persons, or a 15% increase. ABAG's population estimates and projections are summarized below.

	<u>1980</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>
Dublin	15,299	25,500	29,500
Livermore-Amador Valley *	100,230	144,600	160,300
Alameda County	1,105,379	1,272,000	1,330,800

* The Livermore-Amador Valley, or East County, includes the cities of Dublin, Livermore and Pleasanton.

Long Term Projections (1990 - 2005)

The cumulative historical and projected population growth in Alameda County and the City of Dublin is shown below (ABAG, 1989).

	<u>Alameda County</u>	<u>Dublin</u>
1980	1,105,379	15,299
1985	1,191,450	17,600
1990	1,272,000	25,500
1995	1,330,800	29,500
2000	1,387,900	37,100
2005	1,444,600	46,200

Dublin is expected to continue to have the greatest subregional percentage change in Alameda County with a projected 81% increase in population between 1990 and 2005 (or 20,700 additional residents, an annual increase of 1,380 persons). This would bring the total population in Dublin to 46,200 by the year 2005.

During the period 1990-2005, the Livermore-Amador Valley area (East County) will experience the greatest increase in population within Alameda County. Between 1990 and 2005, ABAG estimates that East County will add about 65,000 new residents, or a 45% increase in population.

The projected change for Alameda County between 1990 and 2005 is 172,600 persons, or a 14% increase compared to a 15% increase for the Bay Area.

Age and Ethnic Characteristics

Dublin's population is relatively homogeneous in terms of age and ethnic characteristics. The short span of time during which most of the City's housing was constructed, and the low original housing prices resulted in a predominance of young families in the 1960's and then a slowing of growth and overall aging of the population. In 1980, 92.4% of the population was white, the remainder were Black, Japanese, Chinese, Native American and persons of Spanish origin (U.S. Census Bureau, 1980). Below is a summary of the age characteristics of Dublin's population.

	Percent (1980)	Current Estimated Population*
persons under 18	38.9	9,919
persons 18 - 61	57.8	14,739
persons 62 and over	3.2	800

*The population estimates were derived by applying the percentages from the 1980 Census to the current estimated population of Dublin.

EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

Dublin

Existing Employment

There are currently about 12,210 jobs in Dublin. Between 1985 and 1990, the number of jobs increased by 2,600, a 27% increase. This includes 870 additional retail jobs (21% increase), 860 additional manufacturing and wholesale jobs (63% increase), 770 service jobs (47% increase) and 100 additional other types of jobs (4% increase).

ABAG estimates that 12,000 Dublin residents are currently in the labor force (ABAG, 1989). This represents approximately 77% of the Dublin residents over age 16. The majority of persons are employed in retail jobs, followed by persons in service jobs, manufacturing and wholesale jobs and agricultural and mining jobs. Between 1985 and 1990, the number of employed residents in Dublin increased by 4,000, a 50% increase.

Employment Projections

Between 1990 and 1995, Dublin is projected to have 2,000 additional employed residents, a 17% increase. Dublin is projected to have 3,000 new jobs during this period, or a 25% increase. This represents an existing ratio of jobs to employed residents of 1.0 and a projected (1995) ratio of 1.1. The greater the ratio deviates from 1.0, the greater the jobs/employed residents imbalance (i.e., a ratio of 1.0 represents a numerical balance between the total number of jobs and the total number of employed residents).

The historical and projected cumulative job growth and additional employed residents in Dublin is shown below (ABAG, 1989).

	Jobs	Employed Residents	Jobs/Employed Residents Ratio
1980	8,168	6,497	1.26
1985	9,640	8,000	1.20
1990	12,210	12,000	1.02
1995	15,210	14,000	1.09
2000	17,880	17,500	1.02
2005	20,560	21,700	.95

The cumulative total historical and projected number of new jobs by type in Dublin is as follows (ABAG, 1989):

	<u>1980</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2005</u>
Agricultural and Mining	52	40	10	10	10	10
Mfg & Wholesale	1196	1370	2230	2850	3430	3820
Retail	3173	4230	5100	5730	6920	7890
Service	1567	1640	2410	4000	4670	4910
Other Jobs	2180	2360	2460	2620	2850	3930
Total	8,168	9,640	12,210	15,210	17,880	20560

Alameda County

Existing Employment

Alameda County has reversed the trend of job loss that occurred in the 1970's. The County had a large portion of its employment base in heavy industries that were either declining or not growing. Since 1980 the industry mix has shifted increasingly toward office and service-related industry, with a long-term potential for high technology jobs.

In 1990, there are approximately 608,480 jobs and 647,500 employed residents in Alameda County (ABAG). During the period 1985 to 1990, the number of employed residents in Alameda County increased by 68,100 (12% increase). The number of jobs increased by 58,600 (11% increase). The largest increase in jobs for Alameda County was in the service sector (23,430 new jobs, or a 14% increase), followed by manufacturing and wholesale (15,590 new jobs, or a 14% increase), retail (12,710 new jobs, or a 13% increase) and all other types of jobs (7,580, or a 5% increase). Alameda County led the Bay Area in its increase in manufacturing and wholesale jobs.

Employment Projections

The projected increase in jobs within Alameda County between 1990 and 1995 is 11% which is the same projected change for the Bay Area as a whole (ABAG, 1989). The cumulative historical and projected job growth and additional employed residents in the County are shown below.

	<u>Jobs</u>	<u>Employed Residents</u>	<u>Jobs/Employed Residents Ratio</u>
1980	511,133	522,069	.98
1985	549,850	579,400	.95
1990	608,480	647,500	.94
1995	675,410	707,000	.95
2000	740,600	752,400	.98
2005	783,350	778,900	1.00

For the period 1990 to 2005, Alameda County is projected to have 131,400 additional employed residents, or a 20% increase. Alameda County is also projected to have 174,900 new jobs, or a 29% increase. This represents a 1.3 ratio of new jobs to additional employed residents. For the Bay Area, the ratio of new jobs to additional employed residents is 1.5.

In recent years, commercial and industrial development has increased dramatically in the Tri-Valley area, largely due to the relocation of businesses from San Francisco seeking relief from land scarcity, high lease rates, high housing costs and strict planning controls. ABAG projects a continuation of this trend.

Below are the estimated existing and projected numbers of jobs and employed residents in the Livermore-Amador Valley (ABAG).

	1990			1995		
	Jobs	Employed Residents	Ratio	Jobs	Employed Residents	Ratio
Dublin	12,210	12,000	1.02	15,210	14,000	1.09
Livermore	27,860	31,200	.89	33,540	35,300	.95
Pleasanton	29,180	32,100	.91	36,620	36,400	1.01

However, despite the current and projected (1990 - 1995) relative balance between jobs and employed residents in Dublin and the remainder of the Livermore-Amador Valley, one of the transportation corridors with the most serious imbalance of jobs to employed residents in the San Francisco Bay Area is the I-680 Corridor (Dublin, Alamo-Blackhawk, Clayton, Concord, Danville, Livermore, Pleasant Hill, Pleasanton, San Ramon, Walnut Creek and the remainder of Alameda County).

For the period 1990 - 2005 the projected labor supply deficit for the I-680 Corridor is 27,840 (i.e., 76,600 new employed residents compared to 104,440 new jobs). Livermore is expected to add approximately 25,000 new jobs, or a 91% increase over 1990 employment. Pleasanton will increase its 1990 employment base by about 21,000 jobs, or about a 71% increase by 2005. During the same period, San Ramon is expected to add about 16,700 new jobs between 1990 and 2005.

Tables 1 - 6 in Appendix A contain the following information for the City of Dublin, the Tri-Valley (Dublin, Livermore and Pleasanton in the Livermore-Amador Valley and San Ramon and Danville in the San Ramon Valley), Alameda County and the San Francisco Bay Region (Source: WPM Planning Team, 1990, based upon ABAG data):

Table 1 - ABAG's Population, Household, Employment & Income Projections

Table 2 - Average Annual Changes in ABAG's Projections

Table 3 - Projections: Percentage of Larger Geographic Area

Table 4 - Projections: Per Household & Employment Ratios

Table 5 - Average Annual Changes in Per Household & Employment Ratios

Table 6 - Projections: Per Household & Employment Ratios - Percentage of Larger Area

No annexations, significant changes in land uses or other factors have occurred in Dublin which would affect the ABAG population and employment trend estimates and projections.

HOUSING NEEDS

To assist localities in evaluating their regional housing share, the State requires area wide planning agencies to prepare regional housing needs assessment numbers. Government Code Section 65583 (a)(1) requires a quantification of the locality's existing and projected housing needs for all income levels. The existing and projected needs must include the locality's share of the regional housing need. Government Code Section 65584 defines regional housing need as "a locality's share of the regional housing needs includes that share of the housing needs of persons at all income levels within the area significantly affected by the jurisdiction's plan." ABAG has estimated existing affordable housing needs as of 1988 for communities in the San Francisco Bay Area and the projected housing needs in 1990 and 1995 (ABAG, 1989).

Existing Need (including regional need) is the difference between the number of units actually built and the number that "should have been available calculated from the optimal vacancy rate." Thus, if the available housing stock were increased by the existing need, the market would have been nearer to a balance between housing supply and demand. A balanced housing market depresses inflationary pressures that reduce housing affordability. ABAG estimated the existing (1988) housing demand for Dublin to be zero units. This means that, in general, there was a relative balance between Dublin's housing supply and demand in 1988 (ABAG 1989).

Projected Need (including regional need) is the total number of units needed to accommodate anticipated growth in the city and provide a desirable vacancy rate. The "projected need" figure is the number of additional units that would ideally be developed in the City by 1995, based on the household projections developed by ABAG. Government Code Section 65584 requires that the distribution of regional housing need by ABAG take into account the market demand for housing, employment opportunities, availability of suitable sites and public facilities, commuting patterns, needs of farm workers, the type and tenure of housing in the jurisdiction and the loss of units in assisted housing developments (ABAG 1989)

In 1983 ABAG's determination of Dublin's "projected need" was 1,956 housing units. During the five year planning period for the 1985 Housing Element (January 1985 - January 1990) a total of 2,645 housing units were constructed in Dublin. Thus, the projected need was exceeded by 689 dwelling units.

ABAG's housing needs determinations are for the seven year period from 1988 through 1995. Since the planning period for the Housing Element is from 1990 through 1995, it was necessary to adjust ABAG's housing needs determinations to consider the housing units that were constructed in 1988 and 1989.

ABAG projected the housing need for 1988 - 1990 in Dublin to be 1,479 units. The projected need for the period 1990 - 1995 is 1,912 units which results in a total projected housing need of 3,391 units for the period 1988 - 1995. The adjusted housing needs determinations are as follows:

ABAG's Projected Need 1988 - 1995	3,391 units
Total Units Constructed in 1988 and 1989	920 units*
Projected Need 1990 - 1995	2,471 units

*Refer to page 8 for a breakdown of the units produced by income category

Projected Need by Income Category is not a continuation of current patterns but rather a figure that includes a redistribution of households by income category throughout the region. The objective is to "avoid further impaction of localities with relatively high proportions of lower income households" (Government Code Section 65584). To generate the figures, ABAG averaged existing city percentages in each income category with the existing county and regional percentages.

Definition of Income Categories for Dublin. Four income categories ("very low," "low," "moderate" and "above moderate") were used by ABAG in allocating projected housing needs. These terms are defined in State law (Section 6932 of Title 25 of the California Administrative Code), and establish the categories used in determining eligibility of housing consumers to a variety of housing programs, as well as availability of public funds and assistance to housing providers. State law bases the definitions on a household of four, and does not relate income definitions to different household sizes.

In February, 1990, the estimated median income for a family of four in Alameda County was \$44,100 (State Department of Housing and Community Development, 1990). This estimate is used to determine eligibility for various state and federal housing programs. A current median income estimate was not available for the City of Dublin.

Current (February, 1990) income categories for Alameda County are defined as follows:

Very low income - \$22,050 and below
Less than 50% of the County mean income

Low income - \$22,051 - \$35,280
Between 51% and 80% of the County mean income

Moderate income - \$35,281 - \$52,920

Between 81% and 120% of the County mean income

Above moderate income - \$52,921 and above

Above 120% of the County mean income

ABAG presents "projected need by income category" as both an absolute number of units and a percentage of units in each income grouping. Below are the current desired distribution of households by income category for Dublin (from ABAG's 1989 report, Housing Needs Determinations) compared to Dublin's actual household income distribution in the 1980 Census and the current distribution of households by income category (ABAG's 1989 Housing Needs Determinations).

	<u>1980*</u>	<u>1989**</u>	<u>Number of Units Needed for 1990 - 1995</u>
Very Low	9%	20%	678
Low	11%	14%	475
Moderate	26%	23%	499
Above Moderate	54%	43%	819
Total Projected Need			2,471

* Household income by percent distribution, 1980 Census

** Current distribution of households by income category (ABAG, 1989)

The number of units included in the above table is based upon the following:

	<u>ABAG (1988-1995)*</u>	<u>Units Produced (1988-1989)**</u>	<u>Adjusted Needs (1990-1995)</u>
Very Low	678	0	678
Low	475	0	475
Moderate	780	281	499
Above Moderate	1,458	639	819
Total	3,391	920	2,471

* Housing Needs Determinations, ABAG, January 1989.

** Final inspections issued by Dublin in 1988 and 1989 (refer to Housing Costs in Section 6.1.2, Household Characteristics, for breakdown of sales prices and rents for units which received final inspections from the Dublin Building Department in 1988 and 1989).

ABAG's regional redistribution of household needs by income category would result in more than double the percentage of very low income households in Dublin with relatively slight changes in the percentages of low and moderate income households. Planned and projected units will produce a more diverse mix of housing types than has previously been available in Dublin, which means greater opportunity for production of affordable units. However, it is unlikely that 34% of the units produced in Dublin over the next five years could be made affordable to low and very low income households. This percentage seems particularly unrealistic in light of the extremely limited availability of public subsidies for housing, which would be necessary for production of affordable units at such a large scale.

6.1.2 HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS [65583(a)(2)]

Government Code Section 65583(a)(2) requires that the Housing Element include an analysis and documentation of household characteristics, including level of payment compared to ability to pay, housing characteristics, including overcrowding, and housing stock condition.

NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS

Between 1985 and 1990, the number of total households in Alameda County increased by 39,860 (9% increase). During the same period, the number of households in Dublin increased by 2,062, a 43% increase (ABAG, 1989).

The projected increase in households within the County between 1990 - 1995 is 27,910 households, or a 5.7% increase. The cumulative historical and projected household population growth and persons per household in Alameda County is shown below (ABAG, 1989).

	<u>Household Population</u>	<u>Persons per Household</u>	<u>Total Households</u>
1980	1,077,339	2.53	426,093
1985	1,156,150	2.56	451,750
1990	1,232,900	2.51	491,610
1995	1,290,200	2.48	519,520
2000	1,344,200	2.46	547,320
2005	1,397,100	2.44	527,420

The current number of households in Dublin is 6,862, including 5,215 in owner occupied units and 1,647 rental units (Dublin Planning Department, 1990).

The projected increase in households within Dublin between 1990 - 1995 is 1,600, or a 23% increase. The cumulative historical and projected household population growth and pers per household in Dublin is shown below (ABAG, 1989).

	<u>Household Population</u>	<u>Persons per Household</u>	<u>Total Households</u>
1980	13,772	3.40	4,039
1985	16,000	3.34	4,800
1990	22,800	3.21	6,862 *
1995	26,800	3.16	8,470
2000	34,300	3.14	10,940
2005	43,400	3.10	13,990

* Planning Department estimate (1990) based upon number of existing housing units and vacancy rate.

ABAG's Projections '90 report assumes a 1.25% decrease in the average household size between 1990-1995 in the San Francisco Bay Area. Over the 15-year period from 1990-2005, regional household

size is expected to decline from an estimated average of 2.54 persons per household in 1990 to 2.46 persons in 2005. This represents a 3.1% decline in household size. In the 1990's it is estimated that Dublin will continue to attract the larger size households which have characterized its historical growth.

INCOME

In 1990, ABAG estimates that the mean (average) household income in Dublin was \$49,100 in constant 1988 dollars. The historical and projected mean household income for Alameda County and Dublin is as follows (the projected increase for the Dublin is 2% between 1990 and 1995):

	<u>Alameda County</u>	<u>Dublin</u>
1980	\$35,609	\$44,942
1985	37,800	46,600
1990	40,100 *	49,100
1995	43,000	50,100
2000	45,100	52,600
2005	46,900	55,200

* In February, 1990, the California Department of Housing and Community Development estimated that the median income for a family four in Alameda County was \$44,100. Median income is used for state and federal housing programs.

HOUSING COSTS

Owner Occupied

In 1989, the average cost of a home (both resale and new) in Dublin was \$225,855, compared to \$272,016 for the San Francisco Bay Area. The recent trend has been rapidly upward in the price of housing in Dublin and the remainder of the Tri-Valley area. Below are the historical average sales prices in Dublin (Southern Alameda County Board of Realtors, 1990):

1983	\$109,568
1984	\$122,849
1985	\$134,657
1986	\$144,841
1987	\$153,409
1988	\$173,566
1989	\$225,855

During the past two years, building permits were issued for 949 units in Dublin, including 211 single family units and 738 multi-family units. The sales prices of these new homes varied from \$120,000 for a two bedroom townhouse in a 174 unit development to \$425,000 for a single family home on a view lot. Below is a summary of the sales prices and rents for the new homes in Dublin which received final inspections during the past two years:

<u>Price/Rent Range</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Units</u>
-------------------------	-------------	------------------------

Multi Family:

\$695 - 1,135 (rental)	1989	186 *
\$120,000 (average)	1988	118
\$130,000 - \$149,000	1988	92 **
\$150,000 - \$179,000	1988	172
\$171,000 - \$199,000	1989	78
\$179,000 - \$200,000	1989	63
Total		709

Single Family:

\$210,000 - \$255,000	1988	78
\$230,000 - \$360,000	1988 & 1989	120
\$325,000 - \$425,000	1988	13
Total		211

* Includes 156 units with rents below \$992/month.

** Includes 7 units which sold for less than \$136,500.

The average price per square foot in 1990 for new single family homes is just under \$190 (West Dublin Study). Multi-family units cost about \$150 per square foot.

However, despite the historical increases in housing costs in Dublin, sales prices have dropped slightly during recent weeks. Average prices in Dublin, Livermore and Pleasanton fell by 7.2% to 23% in February 1990 compared to the previous month (Southern Alameda County Board of Realtors). The decrease in prices is believed to be due to a heavy current supply of housing. In July 1989, there were 1,734 homes for sale in Southern Alameda County. In February 1990, there were 1,918 homes for sale, a 10.6% increase.

Rental Housing

Although owner occupied housing unit costs far exceed ability to pay for most families, many rental units are still within the ability of moderate income household's ability to pay. The 1980 Census indicated that the median contract rent in Dublin was \$353. Currently, one bedroom apartment units in older buildings rent for \$500 to \$550/month (Southern Alameda County Apartment Owners Association, 1990). Two and three bedroom apartment units in older building rent for \$600 to \$700. Two and three bedroom apartment units in new buildings rent for about \$700 to \$1,100 per month. Single family houses rent for about \$900 to \$1,200 (three bedrooms, two baths with a double car garage).

DETERMINATION OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME UNIT PRICES

Determination of a unit price affordable to low and moderate income households is important because the State requires cities to give developers density bonuses if 20% of the units in a project are

affordable to lower income or 10% very low income households or 50% senior households. The units must be affordable for 30 years. The City must also provide one or more other incentives. The maximum price of a housing unit affordable to a low income household in Alameda County is \$97,500 and the maximum price of a unit affordable to a moderate income household is \$136,500 (based upon the following method for determining housing cost affordable by a low income household).

- a. Low income definition (80% of Alameda County's median income)
= \$35,280
- b. $\$35,280 \times .9 = \$31,752$ income to be used in determining price. In order to establish a practical range of incomes able to afford a specific price for a unit, it must be affordable to those having 90% of the calculated income.
- c. $\frac{\$31,752}{12} =$ \$661, maximum monthly mortgage payment
25% of gross income (property taxes, utilities and insurance not included)
- d. \$661 payment at 10.25% fixed rate, 30 year term and 10% down payment = \$97,500 mortgage (Schriber, 1990).

The maximum monthly rent for an affordable rental unit (moderate income household) in Alameda County is \$992. Below are affordable rents for the income categories.

	<u>Monthly Rent</u>
Very Low Income	\$0 - \$413
Low Income	\$414 - \$661
Moderate Income	\$661 - \$992
Above Moderate	\$992 and above

LEVEL OF PAYMENT COMPARED TO ABILITY TO PAY

According to State law, a lower-income household that pays more than 25% of its income for housing is living in unaffordable housing and is "overpaying" for housing (the federal threshold to measure overpaying is 30%). For the purpose of determining housing affordability, the City of Dublin uses 25% to measure overpaying.

Clearly, higher income households are more able to spend a greater portion of income on housing without sacrificing basic needs than are low income households. However, households that are technically "overpaying" are not necessarily in immediate need of affordable units. There is no evidence to suggest that all, or even a majority, of overpaying households in Dublin would relocate if additional affordable housing units were available in the City.

Determining exactly how many renter and owner households overpay for housing must await the completion of the 1990 Census. However, ABAG has calculated the proportion of households in 1980 who paid

more than 25% of their income for housing. These ratios were then applied to the current counts of the number of households.

Below are ABAG's estimated total numbers and proportions of low income households overpaying for housing in Dublin (ABAG, 1989).

	<u>Total Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Dublin's Population</u>
low income households (HH) owning	420	1.6%
low income HH renting	361	1.4%
low income HH overpaying (owners)	266	1.0%
low income HH overpaying (renters)	266	1.0%

There is a slightly greater proportion of lower income renter households overpaying for housing than lower-income owners as shown below (ABAG).

Proportion of low income owners overpaying	63%
Proportion of low income renters overpaying	74%

HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

Dublin's housing stock has become more diversified since the 1985 Housing Element was adopted. At that time, the City's housing stock was characterized by single family detached homes with relatively homogeneous prices and sizes. However, with the completion of recent residential projects, the overall nature of the housing stock has begun to change.

OVERCROWDING

Overcrowded housing is an indication of an unmet need for housing from families unable to afford adequately sized accommodation. An overcrowded housing unit is defined by the Census Bureau as one in which there are more than 1.01 persons per room. The 1980 Census reported 109 overcrowded units in Dublin, 2.6% of the City's housing units. Applying this same percentage to the current estimate of 7,073 existing (1990) housing units, results in an estimated 184 existing overcrowded units. Applying the percentages of renters to owners in Dublin's population, results in an estimated 44 overcrowded rental units and 140 overcrowded owner occupied units.

While overcrowding has been declining state wide since the 1960's, the 7.4% overcrowding in California reported in 1980 represents a substantially higher incidence of overcrowding state wide than in the City.

HOUSING STOCK CONDITION

Dublin's housing stock is characterized by homes built within the last 30 years (approximately 95% of the entire housing stock), as

shown below (U.S. Census Bureau, 1980 and Planning Department estimates, 1990).

	<u>Units Built</u>	<u>Percent of Existing Units</u>
1980 to 1989	2,940	41.7%
1970 to 1979	462	6.5%
1960 to 1969	3,314	46.8%
1950 to 1959	156	2.2%
1940 to 1949	186	2.6%
1939 or earlier	15	0.2%

The predominance of buildings constructed within the past 30 years means that the housing stock is in very good condition. Maintenance varies from poor to excellent, but instances of poor maintenance are few and scattered. Dublin's Building Inspector reports few violations. There are no substandard units needing replacement. There have been no homes demolished in the past five years.

The City provides information to the public regarding the Alameda County Home Improvement Loan Program which is administered by the Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development. The program provides low interest home improvement loans to homeowners who have low or moderate incomes. Very few households in Dublin have applied for assistance from the program (refer to Program III.M. in the Goals, Quantified Objectives Policies and Programs Section).

NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS

Between January 1985 and January 1990, a total of 2,645 housing units were constructed in Dublin, including 1,011 single family units and 1,634 multi-family units. Approximately 62% of the new housing units were multi-family and there was an increase in multifamily units within the City from 9% of the total housing stock in 1985 to 29% in 1990. There are no manufactured homes or mobile homes in Dublin. However, manufactured homes and mobile homes are permitted in all single family zoning districts. Below are the total number of existing housing units in Dublin:

	Single Family*	Multi-Family**	Total
1/1/89 Estimate ***	5,024	1,693	6,717
Final Inspections in 1989	29	327	356
Total Existing Units as of 12/31/89	5,053	2,020	7,073

* Single family detached

** Includes single family attached units

*** California Department of Finance, 1989

TENURE*

Approximately 76% of the City's units are occupied by owners while 24% are occupied by renters (1980 Census). Applying these percentages to the total number of existing households (7,073) results in an estimated 5,375 owner households and 1,698 renter households in 1990.

Dublin currently has the lowest proportion of single family houses in its housing stock (71%) compared to the other cities in the Tri-Valley which range from 76% to 93%. By comparison, the Tri-Valley average is about 80% and the County average is 59% (ABAG 1989).

Dublin's housing growth rate during the first nine years of the 1980's has been greater than for the Tri-Valley area, Alameda County or the San Francisco Bay Area as shown below (WPM Planning Team, 1989).

Area	Growth Rate
City of Dublin	62%
Tri-Valley Area	39%
Alameda County	13%
Bay Area	13%

A total of 2,365 building permits for new homes were issued in Dublin from January 1985 through December 1989, including 803 single family homes (34%) and 1,562 multi-family homes (66%). The building permits issued for new homes in Dublin from 1985 through 1989 are shown below (Dublin Building Department, 1990).

	Single Family	Multi-family	Total
1985	195	43	238
1986	259	129	388
1987	251	756	1,007
1988	25	204	229
1989	73	430	503
Total	803	1,562	2,365

*Tenure means the type of occupancy within a housing unit (renter or owner-occupied).

VACANCY RATES

Vacancy rates are a commonly used indicator of the adequacy of the existing housing stock in meeting market area needs. The difference between current and optimal vacancy rates is a good measure of existing need.

The 1980 census reported vacancy rates in Dublin as follows:

	Vacant Units	Percent of Total Units
Vacant for Sale	28	.9
Vacant for Rent	17	1.8

ABAG has used a vacancy goal of 4.5 percent for housing need calculations. In 1988, the vacancy rate for the Bay area was 3.58%. According to the State Department of Finance, as of January 1989 there were 6,516 occupied units in Dublin and an overall vacancy rate of 2.99%. Thus, the overall vacancy rate for Dublin in January 1989 was below the region's vacancy goal as well as the average vacancy rate. This would indicate a need for additional housing to satisfy demand.

A 5% rental vacancy rate is considered necessary to permit ordinary rental mobility (Local Housing Element Assistance Project, 1989). A 2% vacancy rate for owned housing is considered normal. A sample survey in 1983 found virtually no vacancies in Dublin apartments, with waiting lists typical (Blayney-Dyett). However, the relatively low cost of renting and the absence of a requirement of a large down payment makes rentals an important source of affordable market rate housing.

SUBSIDIZED HOUSING

The Arroyo Vista project in Dublin is a 150-unit housing complex for low income families. The Arroyo Vista project was approved by a two-thirds majority vote in the unincorporated area of Alameda County under Article 34 of the California Constitution, as required for publicly owned subsidized housing.

In 1986 the Dublin Housing Authority was formed and the title to the Arroyo Vista project was transferred from the City of Pleasanton Housing Authority to the City of Dublin Housing Authority. The management of Arroyo Vista was transferred from the Pleasanton Housing Authority to the Alameda County Housing Authority (Basgal, 1990).

The Arroyo Vista project houses very low income tenants. There are some existing tenants who are above 50% of the median income limits but admission requirements are 50% of the median income or below.

Income eligibility is only one criterion for tenant selection at Arroyo Vista. Eligible applicants must also meet one of the following federal preferences:

1. Involuntary Displacement, e.g. owner terminates tenancy for reasons beyond the control of the tenant, domestic violence which requires tenant to leave violent circumstances, or government action or a natural disaster requiring tenant to leave the dwelling.
2. Substandard Housing, e.g. unit does not provide safe and adequate shelter, and homelessness.
3. Paying 50% or More of Income for Rent, the amount paid includes a reasonable amount for utilities.

Other subsidized housing in Dublin is available through two Section 8 programs which provide rent subsidies to qualified households. Section 8 certificates provide the difference between one third of a household's income and the monthly cost of an apartment up to a certain standard price. Section 8 new construction funds were used in the construction of The Springs apartments, a 176-unit complex including 36 subsidized units. The Section 8 certificate program is administered by the Alameda County Housing Authority. Currently, the Housing Authority contracts for seven Section 8 units in Dublin (as of December 1, 1989).

Below is a summary of subsidized housing in the Livermore/ Amador Valley (Dublin Planning Department, 1990):

City	Complex	Total (# of units)	Age Group of Tenants	Type Rent Subsidy
Dublin	Arroyo Vista	150	Elderly Family Handicapped	Q.I.
Dublin	The Springs	176 (36 subsidized)	Elderly Family Handicapped	Q.I.
Livermore	Hillcrest Gardens	54	Elderly Handicapped	Q.I. S.I.
Livermore	Leahy Square	125	Family Elderly Handicapped	Q.I.
Livermore	Livermore Gardens	96	Family	Q.I. S.S.
Livermore	Meadowlark	47	Elderly Family Handicapped	Q.I.
Livermore	Vineyard Village	74	Elderly Handicapped	Q.I.
Pleasanton	Kottinger Place	50	Elderly Handicapped	Q.I.
Pleasanton	Pleasanton Gardens	39	Elderly Handicapped	S.S.
Pleasanton	Pleasanton Greens	131	Elderly Family Handicapped	S.S.

Q.I. = 25% of income

S.S. = Sliding Scale

Tenants at Arroyo Vista, The Springs (subsidized units), Livermore Leahy Square and Pleasanton Kottinger Place pay 30% of their income for rent. The same may be true for the other projects listed depending on the type of project financing.

Persons on Waiting Lists for Subsidized Housing

One index of immediate need is the length of waiting lists for subsidized housing in the Tri-Valley. Households on waiting lists are in need of affordable housing and actively seeking to relocate. There is probably some overlap between projects, with a number of households on lists for more than one housing complex. Below are the waiting lists for subsidized housing in the Tri-Valley area as of January 1990 compared to the number on waiting lists for the same projects in June 1983 (Planning Department survey).

City	Complex	Total on Waiting List - 1/90	Total on Waiting List in 1983
Dublin	Arroyo Vista	86	187 *
Dublin	The Springs	22	N/A **
Pleasanton	Kottinger Place	15	29
Pleasanton	Gardens	22	27
Pleasanton	Greens	54	57
Livermore	Hillcrest Gardens	100	110
Livermore	Leahy Square	75	150
Livermore	Gardens	180	50
Livermore	Meadowlark	250	70
Livermore	Vineyard Village	146	86
Total		950	766

* At the time that the waiting list was checked for the Arroyo Vista project in 1983, only 85 of the 150 units were completed.

** A waiting list was not maintained by The Springs in 1983.

Based upon the survey results, the number of persons on waiting lists for subsidized housing has increased by 24% since 1983.

HOUSING SERVICES

The City of Dublin participates in a voucher program in which homeless persons who are referred to the Police Department are given a voucher by the police, for a hotel located in the City of Pleasanton. For Dublin residents in need of housing counseling or emergency shelter, a variety of services exist. Below is a summary of the services that are available (City of Pleasanton and City of Livermore, 1989).

For Seniors

Alameda County Department of Aging
- housing services for seniors, San
Leandro.

General Advisory and Counseling Service,

Shared Housing Placement ECHO Housing Assistance Center -
Housing advisory services, housing
counseling services, discrimination
investigation, Section 8, tenant/
landlord problems, Senior Citizens,
shared housing placement mediation
services. Livermore.

Emergency Shelter

Tri-Valley Haven For Women -
Services for victims of domestic
violence and sexual assault.
Housing, shelter, counseling and
child care program. Pleasanton.

Shepard's Gate - emergency shelter
for women and children. Livermore

Family Crisis Center for Men -
emergency shelter for men.
Livermore.

Family Crisis Center for Families -
emergency shelter for families.
Livermore

Emergency Fund Center - Casework,
disaster, infant supplies, food,
clothing, appliances, material
needs, transportation. Livermore.

Buenas Vidas Ranch - Emergency
Housing for youth (wards of the
court, not homeless) ages 10 to 19
years. Livermore

Emergency Shelter Program, Inc. -
Emergency services include crisis
counseling, temporary shelter for
women and children, meals provided,
advocacy services, children's
program, housing search, job
training. Hayward.

6.1.3 LAND SUITABLE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT [65583(a)(3)]

Government Code Section 65583(a)(3) requires that the Housing Element include an inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having potential for redevelopment. It must also include an analysis of the relationship of zoning and public facilities and services to these sites. During the five year planning period (1990 - 1995), it is projected that 1,905 total additional housing units, 381 units/year, will be constructed in Dublin.

INCORPORATED AREA

Vacant Land

Within the incorporated portions of the City, there are 29 vacant acres, which could yield a total of 202 (maximum) units including 107 single family homes and 95 multiple-family units. The following vacant sites are located within the incorporated portions of the City (refer to Sites for Housing Development Map in Appendix).

	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Projected No. of Units</u>		<u>Current Zoning</u>	<u>No. on Map</u>
		<u>Single Family</u>	<u>Multi-Family</u>		
Arroyo Vista *	6+	0	42-95	PD	2
Fallon School	8	17	0	R-1-B-E**	9
Valley Christian	15	14-90	0	Agricultural	12
Total	29	107	95		

* Includes two sites for multi-family housing: a four acre site and a two acre site.

** R-1-B-E allows sites from 5,000-7,500 square feet.

Projects Currently Under Construction

There are 646 units which have been approved within the city limits but have not received final inspections, as summarized below (Dublin Planning Department, 1990). The locations of the projects are shown on the map of recent residential projects in the Appendix.

<u>No. or Map Name</u>	<u>Total # of Units</u>		<u>Building Permits Issued</u>	<u>Unoccupied</u>
	<u>Single-family</u>	<u>Multi-family</u>		
3.a Bordeaux Estates	175		175	9
3.b Ahmanson	69		69	69
8. Kildara		174	174	132
16a Heritage Commons		303	73	230
16b Dublin Meadows		206	206	206
Total Unoccupied Units				646

Redevelopment Sites

Sites having potential for redevelopment are zoned for a higher residential density than the development that currently exists on the site. If these sites were redeveloped at the current land use density, then more units could be developed on the lots. However, with very few units over 30 years old and a small number of units needing repair, it is unlikely that redevelopment resulting in more intensive use of presently developed land will occur within the five year time frame of the housing program.

In addition, residential designations have been considered for several commercially zoned sites and rejected. Planning Commission and City Council members chose to retain commercial designations because of concerns regarding traffic and land use compatibility and in recognition of anticipated demand for commercial sites.

The only sites having potential for redevelopment within Dublin are those in the downtown intensification area where mixed commercial/residential uses are allowed (refer to Site 13 on the Sites for Development Map in the Appendix). The Downtown Specific Plan which was adopted in 1987 allows up to 200 additional multi-family units within the downtown area. It should be noted that while the potential for density increases in the downtown area, not all property owners redevelop their property, or develop it to the maximum density permitted. To date no property owners in this area have proposed residential units on their sites.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE AND EXTENDED PLANNING AREA

The available vacant land designated for residential development within the City's Sphere of Influence is 179 acres with a potential yield of 497 units. All of this area is within the Hansen Hill Ranch annexation area which is currently being reviewed by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO).

Dublin has designated an extended planning area, largely within its sphere of influence, that "bears relation to its planning" (Government Code Section 65300). The extended planning area is largely undeveloped and is characterized by steep slopes with oak woodlands west of the City and rolling grasslands east of the City. The area also includes the public lands comprising Parks Reserve Forces Training Area (RFTA), Santa Rita Rehabilitation Center, and Tassajara Regional Park. These areas include Hansen Hill, Donlan Canyon, East Dublin and West Dublin. Portions of East Dublin and West Dublin also lie within the City's sphere of influence.

The total number of projected units within the extended planning area is 12,697 to 24,897 units, including 7,960 to 15,620 multi-family units and 4,737 to 9,277 single family units (Planning Department, 1990). Below are the projected total number of units in areas under consideration by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for annexation to the City and the projected annexation dates.

<u>Area</u>	<u>Estimated # of Units Multi-family</u>	<u>Single Family</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Projected Year of Annexation</u>
Hansen Hill	-	180	180	1990
Donlan Canyon	300	17	317	1990
East Dublin *	7,000-14,000	3,000-6,000	10,000-20,000	1992
West Dublin *	660-1,320	1,540-3,080	2,200-4,400	1992
Total	7,960-15,620	4,737-9,277	12,697-24,897	

- * It is currently unknown how many housing units will be produced in East Dublin or West Dublin during the planning period because zoning has not been established for residential development in these areas (i.e., the estimated number of units shown above may be revised during the review process).

If East Dublin and West Dublin are annexed to the City by the projected year (1992), construction could begin in 1994, thereby producing units within the five year planning period of the Housing Element. Prior to the year 2005, the demand for units is projected to be 3,725 total units (about 350 units/year). It is possible that a total of approximately 350 units could be built in East Dublin and/or West Dublin during the five year planning period.

The projected total number of units in the extended planning area during the five year planning period is 847 to 857 units, including 475 multi-family units and 372 to 382 single family units as summarized below.

<u>Area</u>	<u>Estimated Number of Units</u>		
	<u>Multi-family</u>	<u>Single Family</u>	<u>Total</u>
Hansen Hill	-	180-190	180-190
Donlan Canyon	300	17	317
East and West Dublin	175	175	350
Total	475	372-382	847-857

RELATIONSHIP OF ZONING AND PUBLIC FACILITIES TO HOUSING SITES

The sites described above within the city limits currently have adequate services available to accommodate their potential development. In addition, the existing General Plan land use designations and zoning for these areas would allow the potential development discussed above, with the exception of the Valley Christian Center property. It is currently within the Agricultural District. The zoning has not been changed on the Valley Christian

Center site. The property owner has not submitted a proposal for a residential project.

General Plan designations for the extended planning area are schematic in nature. General Plan Policy 2.1.4 calls for consideration of residential development on moderate slopes with multi-family densities on flatter land and next to business park areas. The potential number of units cannot be determined until utility plans for extension of urban services are prepared and further studies are completed. For example, the capacity of existing sewerage facilities must be expanded. Infrastructure needs for West Dublin also include the construction of on and off ramps from I 580 at Schaffer Canyon.

LAND INVENTORY SUMMARY

The total number of projected units in the five year planning period is 1,905, as summarized on the next page.

SITES SUITABLE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE FIVE YEAR PLANNING PERIOD

Project (# on Map)	General Plan Designation	Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	# of Acres	Density Range (units/acre)	Dwelling Unit Capacity	Projected Year of Annexation	Projected Year of Rezoning	Projected Year Services Available
<u>Vacant Sites Within City Limits</u>									
Arroyo Vista (#2)	Medium Density	PD	N/A	6+	6.1 to 14	95	N/A	N/A	Available
Fallon School (#9)	Single Family	R-1-B-C	N/A	8	.9 to 6	17	N/A	N/A	Available
Valley Christian (#12)	Pub/Semi-Pub	Ag	R-1-B-E	15	.9 to 6	90	N/A	N/A	Available
<u>Projects Under Construction</u>									
Bordeau Estates (#3a)	Single Family	PD	N/A	89	.9 to 6	9	N/A	N/A	Available
Ahmanson (#36)	Single Family	PD	N/A	34	.9 to 6	69	N/A	N/A	Available
Kildara (#8)	Medium Density	PD	N/A	13	6.1 to 14	132	N/A	N/A	Available
Heritage Commons (#16a)	Medium Density	PD	N/A	21.7	6.1 to 14	230	N/A	N/A	Available
Dublin Meadows (#16b)	Medium Density	PD	N/A	16.5	6.1 to 14	206	N/A	N/A	Available
<u>Redevelopment Sites</u>									
Downtown (#11)	Commercial/ Light Indust	C-1, M-1, C-2 & PD	N/A N/A	"	N/A	200	N/A	N/A	Available
<u>Extended Planning Area</u>									
Hansen Hill (#7)	Single Family	PD	N/A	57.2	.5 to 3.0	190	1990	1990	1991
Donlan Canyon (#25)	Single Family, Medium to High Density	Ag	**	197	.5 to 25	317	1990	1990	1991
East Dublin (#26)	Open Space/Res	Unknown	Unknown	7,400	N/A	175	1992	1992	1993
West Dublin (#27)	Open Space/Res	Unknown	Unknown	3,400	N/A	175	1992	1992	1993
TOTAL						1,905			

"The extent to which residential development is appropriate in the downtown, and the area of future intensification is not known at this time.
 **The proposed zoning of Donlan Canyon is as follows: Land Use Designation - Low Density Single-Family Residential (0.5 to 3.0 DU/Acre) 13 acres;
 medium-high density (14.1 to 25 DU/Acre) 19.1 acres; open space; stream corridor 164.9 acres

6.1.4 GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS [65583(a)(4)]

Government Code Section 65583(a)(4) requires that the Housing Element include an analysis of potential and actual governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including land use controls, building codes, and their enforcement, site improvements, fees and other exactions required of developers, and local processing and permit procedures.

Local governments are empowered with the authority to regulate, among other things, the location, density, timing, and type of residential development which occurs in their jurisdiction. This authority is exerted in several ways, from controlling land uses through zoning to levying development fees and exactions to pay for municipal improvements. While intended to protect the interests of residents, local regulations can have effects which present potential barriers to the production of housing.

LAND USE CONTROLS

The Municipal Code Zoning Districts correspond to the General Plan land use designations. Each general plan designation and its implementing zone specify allowed or conditionally permitted land uses and set forth property development standards such as maximum density, minimum lot size, setbacks, and building height requirements.

The Dublin Zoning Ordinance provides five basic residential districts; single-family, two-family, four-family, multiple and suburban residential. The general lot size requirements for each district are described below. More complete details on the requirements for each district are contained in the Zoning Ordinance.

- The single family residential district (R-1) requires a separate 5,000 square foot lot for each residence. Only one residence may be constructed on a lot. R-1-L, R-1-L-B-E, and R-1-B-E districts also permit only one residence per lot but the minimum lot size is specified. The required front yard and rear yard setbacks are 20 feet. The maximum building height is 25 feet (two stories).
- The two-family residential district (R-2) also has a 5,000 square foot building site requirement, but on this building site may be located one two-family or two one-family residences. The required front and rear yard setbacks are 20 feet. The maximum building height is 25 feet (two stories).
- The four-family residential district (R-4) requires a 6,000 square foot lot minimum building site area and allows one unit for each 1,200 square feet. The required front and rear setbacks are 20 feet. The maximum building height is 45 feet or 75 feet, depending upon the lot coverage.

- The suburban residence (R-S) district has a basic density requirement of one unit for each 5,000 square feet of lot area, but unlike the R-1, R-2 and R-3 districts, each unit (or group of units) does not have to be on a separate lot. The required front and rear setbacks are 20 feet. The maximum building height is 25 feet (two stories).
- Planned Development (PD) zoning is another category that permits greater flexibility in addressing site-specific or project objective issues. The overall density generally falls into the range of one of the regular zoning categories but site layout and other matters are permitted greater flexibility.

Since the amount of vacant land within the City limits is minimal (29 acres), the densities allowable under the existing residential zoning districts are not considered to be a constraint to providing adequate housing for all income levels. In addition, the present zoning reflects the land uses that have existed in Dublin for over 20 years. Recent construction over the past ten years has been primarily multi-family development. However, the City will review the development standards (setbacks, building height, parking, etc.) to determine whether changes should be made to reduce development costs (refer to Program I.C. in the Goals, Quantified Objectives, Policies and Housing Programs Section).

Zoning could be a constraint to housing if the density categories are low in an area that could support higher density residential development. To encourage higher density development, the City will 1) consider higher densities near the proposed BART station, 2) the use of air rights over parking lots and sites with low intensity land uses to build housing, 3) an ordinance allowing density bonuses in excess of those called for by State law, 4) an inclusionary housing ordinance and 5) other incentives (refer to Programs I.A., I.B., I.D., and I.E. in the Goals, Quantified Objectives, Policies and Housing Program Section). These programs will provide incentives for constructing affordable housing units.

BUILDING CODES

Dublin uses the Uniform Building Code and Uniform Housing Code as the basis for the City's building standards. These codes are enforced by the Building Department as new projects are proposed or completed, or existing housing is upgraded to current standards.

The City does not have a systematic code enforcement program. Existing units are inspected only when complaints are received by the City. If code violations are discovered, owners are only required to make improvements which bring the property up to minimum code requirements. Because the City has not adopted more stringent standards, the enforcement of the UBC does not pose a significant constraint to the production or improvement of housing in Dublin.

SITE IMPROVEMENTS

The provision of on-site improvements is a standard condition of all new development in Dublin. These improvements usually include streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, landscaping, drainage, water, sewer, power and communications utilities. In some cases, off-site improvements may be required (e.g., drainage or flood control, street widening, etc.). These requirements are not excessive and are comparable to provisions in neighboring cities.

FEES AND EXACTIONS

One often cited constraint is the high cost of development fees and permits. These include fees for planning services, building permits, sewer and water hookups and park land dedication. Development fees raise housing costs diminishing the pool of possible buyers for any given project.

Though fees act to reduce the rate of residential development, they are an essential means of funding necessary services for new development. Given the choice made by Californians in 1978 when Proposition 13 passed, Dublin (like other jurisdictions) has no practical alternative resources with which to fund basic improvements to serve new residences.

Planning Fees and Processing Time

Planning Department fees for major projects (e.g., rezonings, planned development projects and subdivisions) are on a fee for service basis. The applicant submits a deposit with the City and pays the actual costs for processing the project. For smaller projects the fees vary from \$25 for a variance in an R-1 District to \$350 for refiling a previously approved subdivision map.

Processing time for planning applications vary depending upon the completeness of the application the complexity of the request and various State and local processing requirements. For example, recent zone change applications have gone to public hearing within about one month after submittals were found to be complete. Allowing two additional months for City Council hearings and the 30-day effective period, the estimated overall processing of a zone change would be three months from the time that the application submittal was completed. Recent conditional use permit applications have gone to public hearings within about five weeks after the submittals were found to be complete. Recent variance and subdivision applications have gone to public hearing within an average of two months after the submittals were found complete.

Program II.B. would reduce application fees for senior projects and developments providing 10% or more units affordable for very low, low and moderate income households (refer to the Goals, Quantified Objectives, Policies and Housing Programs Section).

Building Fees and Processing Time

The current building permit fees for residential uses are \$56.50/sq. ft. of living area plus \$15/sq. ft. for the garage. For example, a new home costing \$137,000 would have a building permit and plan check fee of \$1,164. The processing time for building permits varies depending upon the quality of the plans submitted by the applicant.

Other Fees

Engineering fees are charged on a time and material basis, similar to other cities in the area. Park dedication requirements are based upon .011 acres/unit for single family subdivisions and .009 acres/unit for multi-family subdivisions. In-lieu fees are calculated by multiplying the acreage requirement by the value of the undeveloped land.

PROCESSING TIME AND PERMIT PROCEDURES

Depending on the complexity and magnitude of the development proposal, the time which elapses from application submittal to project approval may vary considerably. Examples of factors which affect the duration of development review are whether the land to be developed requires annexation or rezoning or whether a Negative Declaration, rather than an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), is sufficient.

Generally, all developments undergo an environmental review and design review to ensure the continuity of design throughout the City. This process can take anywhere between six weeks for a small design review application, up to six months or longer for a subdivision application requiring an Environmental Impact Report.

Fees for processing development proposals can be significant and combined with long processing time can add to the cost of housing. Dublin has made every effort to minimize processing times and fees.

Program II. A. would provide priority processing for senior projects and developments providing 10% or more units affordable for very low, low and moderate income households (refer to Goals, Quantified Objectives, Policies and Housing Programs Section).

6.1.5 NONGOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS [65583(a)(5)]

Government Code Section 65583(a)(5) requires that the Housing Element include an analysis of potential and actual nongovernmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including the availability of financing, the price of land, and the cost of construction.

While local government actions can have a significant effect on the production of housing, there are several market related factors, acting independently and beyond a local government's immediate control, which may pose barriers to housing production.

The inventory of non-governmental constraints can be separated into two groups: those that increase housing cost to the consumer and those factors that reduce or slow down housing development. In the first category are financing, land prices and construction costs. In the second category are community opposition to high density housing, possible lack of infrastructure capacity and competition of different land uses for undeveloped land.

AVAILABILITY OF FINANCING

The cost of borrowing money to finance the construction of housing or to purchase a home can have a large impact on the amount of affordable priced housing produced and subsequently purchased in a community. Fluctuating interest rates can eliminate many potential home buyers from the housing market or render infeasible a housing project which, at lower interest rates, could have been successfully marketed. Rental housing costs are also affected by higher interest rates, since the owner will pass added costs directly to the tenant in the form of higher contract rents.

Financing is generally available in Dublin. There are no mortgage deficient areas in Dublin.

Interest rates are not significantly different than other areas in Northern California. Current prevailing interest rates for a conventional single-family mortgage are about 10% to 11%, assuming a 30-year fixed rate loan with an 80% loan to value ratio. These rates represent a noticeable decline from the mid-1984 rates of 13% to 14% for comparable loans.

PRICE OF LAND

The cost of land is one housing constraint where local government actions and market forces are closely related. Land prices in Dublin depend on a number of factors, including: the allowable density and type of residential development suitable for the property, the proximity to the freeway and commercial developments, and the quality of nearby existing development. Because the City is relatively built out, there is not an abundant supply of undeveloped land, a factor which pushes up prices further.

COST OF CONSTRUCTION

An ongoing survey of construction costs in the San Francisco Bay Area conducted by the Bank of America reveals that materials and labor costs are continually increasing. In July 1983, the per square foot construction cost of a typical, three-bedroom/two-bath, standard quality, single-family home was \$46.73. By July 1987, the per square foot construction cost of an identical home had risen to \$53.67, an almost 15% increase in four years (Bank of America, 1987).

COMMUNITY OPPOSITION TO MEDIUM AND HIGH DENSITY HOUSING

Two multi-family residential projects proposed in Dublin were delayed and finally were approved at reduced densities as a consequence of opposition of nearby residents to multi-family dwellings at high densities. Community concerns that have been raised centered on noise and traffic impacts, aesthetics and neighborhood character.

Opposition of some Dublin residents to higher density housing has impeded development of a wider variety of housing types than the city has had in the past. Approvals contingent on redesign have meant projects with fewer and larger, more costly units than initially proposed by developers. However, despite density reductions resulting from community sentiment, medium-high density has been approved in Dublin since 1985.

POSSIBLE LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY

The most prominent public facilities issue faced in Dublin and other Tri-Valley cities is limited sewer capacity (refer to the Dublin General Plan Land Use and Circulation Element, Section 4.3). Sewage collection and treatment and effluent disposal are provided to Dublin residents and businesses by the Dublin San Ramon Services District (DSRSD), a member of the Livermore Amador Valley Water Management Agency (LAVWMA). DSRSD owns and operates its own sewage treatment plant, while LAVWMA owns an effluent pipeline used by member jurisdictions, DSRSD and the cities of Pleasanton and Livermore.

DSRSD's treatment plant can be expanded to four times its present size, but the LAVWMA pipeline that carries treated effluent through Dublin Canyon to the Bay is nearing capacity. Development of additional LAVWMA capacity in the form of another pipeline in the Valley would require Valley-wide voter approval.

Thus, the capacity of existing sewerage facilities is a potential constraint to the growth of both East Dublin and West Dublin. Infrastructure costs for West Dublin will also be relatively high due to the required construction of on and off ramps from I 580 at Schaffer Canyon. Other potential long term constraints include solid waste and water supply and distribution (ABAG).

The analysis of capital/infrastructure costs for the East Dublin planning alternatives found that the magnitude of the capital cost load estimated would not be totally insupportable, but it would be among the highest for recent Bay Area development (Wallace, Roberts & Todd, East Dublin Specific Plan/General Plan Amendment Studies, 1990). This is due largely to the limited sewer capacity, the required improvements to Interstate 580, and the fact that infrastructure is currently not available to the area. Consequently, absorption rates in East Dublin may be slowed by this cost disadvantage.

COMPETITION AMONG LAND USES

Closely related to the limited availability of land in Dublin is the tension between competing uses for what limited undeveloped land does exist. For example, in deciding on General Plan designations for the Fallon School site, the need for housing was weighed against the growing need for recreation facilities as the city's population grows. The resulting plan devotes a portion of the site to park land while designating the remaining acreage for residential development.

CONCLUSION

With a total of 2,645 housing units constructed between January 1985 and January 1990 (approximately 37% of Dublin's existing housing stock), it becomes clear that, overall, neither governmental nor non-governmental constraints are impeding the total number of housing units which are being produced. Furthermore, since the City's development fees and exactions are comparable to surrounding jurisdictions, governmental constraints do not appear to be unreasonably increasing housing costs. The problem has been the high cost of housing caused primarily by non-governmental constraints which have resulted in limited housing available for low and moderate income households.

6.1.6 SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS [65583(a)(6)]

Government Code Section 65583(a)(6) requires that the Housing Element include an analysis of any special housing needs, including those of the following population groups:

- Handicapped
- Elderly
- Large families
- Farm workers
- Families with female heads of households
- Families and persons in need of emergency shelter

HANDICAPPED PERSONS

The Valleys Corridor Project which was prepared by United Way of the Bay Area in 1982 reports the number of persons in Dublin and the Valley corridor with major disabling conditions (United Way of the Bay Area, 1982). The two categories likely to include the greatest portion of people with special housing needs are "Amputees and Others" and "Other Physical Disorders" which total 803, or 5.9% of Dublin's 1980 population.

This figure can be compared with the 1980 Census counts of those with work place and public transportation disabilities, totaling 722, or 5.3% of Dublin's residents (U.S. Census Bureau, 1980). The figure double counts an unknown number of people who have both work place and public transportation disabilities.

In sum, 5% represents the high end of an estimated portion of Dublin's households with special housing needs related to disabling conditions. Applying this percentage to the estimated 1990 population results in an estimated 1,275 handicapped persons in Dublin. Applying the percentages of renters to owners in Dublin's population, results in an estimated 306 handicap persons renting and 969 handicap persons owning.

The special housing needs of the disabled population are accessible housing units, housing within convenient access of services, and special design features to mitigate the disability. State law requires handicap provisions in all rental apartment units. All recent construction of apartment units has incorporated these provisions.

ELDERLY PERSONS

The 1980 Census reported 429 Dublin residents over age 62, representing 3.2% of the City's population, considerably below the Bay Area total of 12.6% (U.S. Census Bureau, 1980). Applying the 1980 percentage to the 1990 population would result in 816 residents over age 62. Applying the percentages of renters to owners in Dublin's population, results in an estimated 196 elderly persons renting and 620 elderly persons owning.

Unfortunately, data is not available which indicates the portion of Dublin's elderly households that are overpaying. The generally low incidence of overcrowded and unsafe housing units in the city suggests that these are not problems for the elderly or other groups with special housing needs.

Access to services is another concern for the elderly. The shopping opportunities in Dublin's relatively compact downtown are attractive to those with mobility problems, but may be offset by delays associated with bus transit.

Low and moderate income elderly households have greater opportunities to find subsidized housing in the Tri-Valley area than do families. This is probably attributable to the relative ease of gaining acceptance for affordable housing when it is provided for seniors instead of families with children. Five of the Tri Valley's ten subsidized housing complexes are for elderly and disabled households only.

Recent studies have shown that seniors are living longer and as they age require some form of assisted living care when they are no longer able to, or wish to, live independently. To address these needs, housing for seniors is changing and more congregate living facilities are needed. Senior housing facilities and shared housing are discussed in more detail in the housing program section.

LARGE FAMILIES

A family with five or more persons is considered a large family. The 1980 Census reported a total of 746 large families, 19% of the total number of families in Dublin (U.S. Census Bureau, 1980). Applying this percentage to the 1990 population results in an estimated 4,845 large families in Dublin. Applying the percentages of renters to owners in Dublin's population, results in an estimated 1,163 large families renting and 3,682 large families owning.

Though data is not available that relates family size to ability to pay, the frequency of large families living in unsuitable housing units would presumably be evident by a high incidence of overcrowding. Since overcrowding is reported to occur in less than 3% (188 units) of Dublin's housing units, it appears that large families are not facing severe housing problems in the city.

FARMWORKERS

State law requires analysis of the special needs of Farm workers. Dublin does not contain any land which is currently used for agricultural purposes, other than some land used for grazing in East Dublin and West Dublin. To the best of our knowledge, there are virtually no Farm workers in Dublin who require special housing assistance.

FAMILIES WITH FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

The 1980 Census reported 222 female headed households with children present, 5.3% of the City's population (U. S. Census Bureau, 1980), as compared with almost 10% reported for the Bay Area. The number of female headed households with children living below poverty was 22, 0.6% of all Dublin households. The corresponding figure for the Bay Area was 44,061, or 2.2% of all households. Applying the 1980 percentages to the estimated 1990 population in Dublin, there would be 1,352 single parent female headed households and the number of female headed households with children living below poverty would be 43.

FAMILIES AND PERSONS IN NEED OF EMERGENCY SHELTER

State legislation (AB 2579) enacted September 30, 1984 requires, among other provisions, local governments to assess in the housing element the need for temporary or emergency shelter in their community (Government Code Section 65583 (a)(6). Effective January 1, 1988, housing elements are required to identify "adequate sites which will be made available through appropriate zoning and development standards and with public services and facilities needed to facilitate the development of ... emergency shelters and transitional housing" (Government Code Section 65583 (c)(1).

Homebase, a regional support center for homeless policy and programs, reported approximately 6,000 homeless persons in Alameda County in 1989. It also reported 535 shelter beds which represents a ratio of 11 homeless persons for each shelter bed (this does not include vouchers to house people on an emergency basis in low-rent hotels). The ratio for the Bay Area is 15 homeless persons for each shelter bed (Homebase, 1989).

A survey of emergency shelter providers in the Tri-Valley area (including a conversation with Reverend Earl Heverly of the Good Samaritan Committee in Dublin which issues emergency shelter vouchers) revealed that in 1989 a total of 92 individuals from Dublin spent 756 bed nights in emergency shelters in the Tri-Valley area. Below is a summary of number of beds available, the number of persons from Dublin that were provided with shelter and the costs of providing shelter.

Program	No. Beds	No. Persons	No. Bed Nights	Cost Per Bed Night	Total
Tri-Valley Haven for Women	30	11	217	\$44.85	\$9,732
Sheperd's Gate	16	15	180	\$37.47	\$6,745
Family Crisis Center for Men	6	0	0	\$10.00	0
Family Crisis Center for Families	15	11	237	\$15.37	\$3,643
Emergency Shelter	44	4	71	\$32.00	\$2,272
Good Samaritan Committee Motel/ Hotel Vouchers	0	51**	51	\$33.50	\$1,709
Total	111	92	756	\$31.88*	\$24,101

* Average cost per night bed (all providers).

** Reverend Heverly estimates 60% of these persons were transients.

According to the Dublin Police Department, Dublin does not have a permanent population of homeless persons living outside of shelters similar to the situations in larger cities in Alameda County. When the Police Department was contacted in February 1990, they indicated that there are currently no known homeless persons living in Dublin (Clouse, 1990). The homeless are usually either individuals from Dublin who normally have homes and jobs but lose their homes due to financial reasons or family stress, or are transients passing through Dublin to large urban centers to the west. Homeless persons are directed to emergency shelters or are offered hotel vouchers for a hotel in Pleasanton. Locations where homeless persons have stayed include under the overpass between Clark Avenue and Sierra Court and in cars parked in the rear of parking lots.

Due to the low numbers of homeless persons in Dublin, it is generally felt that there are adequate number of existing programs in the Tri-Valley area to adequately accommodate existing needs. However, residents from Dublin and a small percentage of transients did cost emergency shelter providers \$24,101 in 1989. The City will consider supporting the existing programs to the extent of its resident's needs by purchasing bed spaces and/or providing financial assistance (refer to Program II.E. in the Goals, Quantified Objectives, Policies and Housing Program Section).

Other potential means of providing support would be to 1) provide financial assistance to the existing motel voucher system administered by the Valley Christian Center, and 2) providing funding and/or personnel support to encourage churches in Dublin to provide winter relief to homeless persons in the form of food and shelter (refer to the Housing Program Section). In addition, the City will consider amending the Zoning Ordinance to allow emergency shelters in multi-family zoning districts as a conditional use (refer to Program I.F. in the Goals, Quantified Objectives, Policies and Housing Programs Section).

6.1.7 OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION [65583(a)(7)]

Government Code Section 65583(a)(7) requires that the Housing Element include an analysis of opportunities for energy conservation with respect to residential development. Rapidly rising energy costs over the past decade have focused attention on the patterns of energy consumption and the opportunities for energy conservation in all sectors of society. Residential-related energy use is one area where opportunities for modifying energy consumption exist. Once considered an insignificant factor of housing costs, the energy needed to fuel residential heating and cooling systems and household appliances is consuming and increasing share of a household's income devoted to housing expenses.

Recognizing the potential for saving through energy conservation techniques, the California Energy Commission developed standards for new residential construction and additions to existing dwellings. These regulations are contained in Title 24 (State Building Standards Code) of the California Code of Regulations.

The City of Dublin currently enforces the State Energy Conservation Standards. In addition to the Mandatory Features and Devices which all new construction must include, the regulations establish minimum levels of wall, ceiling, and floor insulation, maximum glazing area, minimum glazing U-values (e.g., single, double, or triple glazing), and minimum space conditioning and water heating system efficiencies. Credit for thermal mass, shading, infiltration control, and solar space and water heating is also considered.

It is in approving site plans and subdivision maps that the City can assure that new developments will have energy efficient designs. Prior to project approval, the City requires developers to demonstrate that solar orientation and access has been a consideration in site design.

6.2 HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS THAT ARE ELIGIBLE TO CHANGE TO NON-LOW-INCOME HOUSING USES (Government Code Section 65583(a)(8))

Government Code Section 65583(a)(8) enacted in 1989 (SB 1282) requires that the Housing Element include an analysis of existing housing developments that are eligible to change to non-low-income housing uses during the next 10 years due to termination of subsidy contracts, mortgage prepayment, or expiration of use restrictions. The Housing Element must identify all federal, state and local subsidized housing in the city, note when the subsidies expire and determine the cost of replacing that housing.

In the 1960's, the federal government provided low-interest loans and rent subsidies through various programs administered by the federal Housing and Urban Development Department (HUD) and the Farmers Home Administration (FHA). In return, private developers/owners agreed to build or operate rental projects which were protected by 40-year low income use restrictions. In order to stimulate private participation, the owners were given the option to terminate their contracts prior to the loan maturity dates. As owners exercise their options, the units may be sold or converted to market-rate units. In many cases the tenants are displaced and the inventory available to lower-income rental units declines.

SUBSIDIZED DEVELOPMENTS

There are two federally subsidized low income projects in Dublin. Arroyo Vista is also a federally funded low income project located at 6700 Dougherty Road, Dublin, CA 94568. The subsidy terminates 40 years after the permanent financing was issued on the project (i.e., in the year 2003). Thus, Arroyo Vista is not at risk to convert to non-low income housing uses during the next ten year period.

The Springs Apartments complex is located at 7100 San Ramon Road, Dublin, California 94568. The Springs was constructed with 20-80 tax exempt bond financing in 1981. The Springs complex includes 176 total units including 36 Section 8 units. The 36 Section 8 units are occupied by 18 families and 18 elderly households. The Section 8 units include 7 one bedroom units and 29 two bedroom units (Giordano, 1990).

The earliest date of Section 8 subsidy termination for the Springs is September 25, 1991. If the owner does not choose to opt out of the Section 8 contract in 1991, he or she may renew it in five year intervals for a total of ten additional years (California Coalition of Rural Housing Projects, 1989) or HUD could issue Section 8 Certificates to the Alameda County Housing Authority. The Dublin Housing Authority does not have a Section 8 program (Basgal, 1990).

The City will work with the property owner and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to encourage the parties to negotiate a contract renewal. However, in the event that the property owner decides to opt out of the Section 8 contract, the City will work with a non-profit entity (such as the Volunteers of

America, BRIDGE or Eden Housing) to consider acquiring the Springs Apartments and provide equivalent rent subsidies.

The Volunteers of America, BRIDGE and Eden Housing have expressed interest in providing low income housing in Dublin. Eden Housing and Bridge possess the legal and managerial capacity to acquire and manage a project such as the Springs. Eden Housing has been in operation since 1963. BRIDGE has been in operation since 1983.

There is no redevelopment agency in the City of Dublin. Neither the Dublin Housing Authority nor the Alameda County Housing Authority have any administrative fees (reserves) available for funding new programs within the City of Dublin (Dross, 1990).

In addition to federally subsidized units, State law (Government Code Section 65583 (a)(8) requires the City to identify and gather information on any projects developed with assistance from any of the following programs, and which are subject to low-income use restrictions which could be terminated within the next ten years:

- FmHA Sec. 515 Rural Rental Housing Loans
- HUD Community Development Block Grant Program
- State (CHFA) and local multifamily revenue bond programs,
- redevelopment programs
- local in-lieu fees,

and units that were developed pursuant to:

- a local inclusionary housing program
- Government Code Section 65916, a density bonus project which has direct financial assistance and affordability controls.

However, there are no existing housing units within the City which were developed with assistance from any of the above-referenced programs.

COST OF REPLACEMENT HOUSING

Eden Housing recently built Ridge View Commons, a 200 unit subsidized multi-family project in the City of Pleasanton. The total construction cost was approximately \$75,000/unit (Truesdale, 1990). Assuming similar construction and land costs in Dublin, 36 new rental units would cost approximately \$2,700,000. The estimated cost of preserving (i.e., providing rent subsidies from funding source(s) other than Section 8) of the 36 units over a four year period (1991 through 1995) is approximately \$640,000. This estimate is based upon an average monthly rent subsidy of \$370/unit (Giordano, 1990). Preservation of the 36 Section 8 units until the year 1995 would provide time for new replacement housing to be constructed (e.g., through implementation of the programs to provide new units for very low and low income households, such as the inclusionary housing program).

6.3 GOALS, QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES, POLICIES [65583(b)] AND HOUSING PROGRAM [65583(c)]

Government Code Section 65583(b) requires that the Housing Element include a statement of Dublin's goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to the maintenance, preservation, improvement and development of housing. The quantified objectives should establish the maximum number of housing units that can be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved over the five-year planning period.

State law recognizes that the total housing needs identified may exceed available resources and the City's ability to satisfy this need within the General Plan. Under these circumstances, the quantified objectives need not be identical to the identified existing housing needs, but should establish the maximum number of housing units that can be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved over a five-year time frame.

Government Code Section 65583(c) requires that the Housing Element include a program which sets forth a five-year schedule of actions to implement the housing goals, objectives and policies through the administration of land use and development controls, provision of regulatory concessions and incentives, the utilization of appropriate federal and state financing and subsidy programs when available and the utilization of moneys in a low and moderate income housing fund of an agency which has established a redevelopment project area pursuant to community redevelopment law. In order to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community, the program must do all of the following:

1. Identify the agencies and officials responsible for the implementation of the various actions and the means by which consistency will be achieved with other general plan elements and community goals;
2. Identify adequate sites which will be made available through appropriate zoning and development standards and with public services and facilities needed to meet the needs of all income levels; including rental housing, factory-built housing, mobile homes, emergency shelters and transitional housing;
3. Assist in the development of adequate housing to meet the needs of low- and moderate-income households;
4. Address and, where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing;
5. Conserve and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock; and
6. Promote housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin or color.

In addition, SB 1282 requires the Housing Element to address whether a program to preserve subsidized housing for lower income households is feasible. However, a provision of current law specifically provides that local governments are not required to allocate funds to subsidize housing for low income persons (Government Code Section 65589). Therefore, the implementation program should identify use of redevelopment programs, and federal and state grants and loans for development and preservation of low income housing.

This section outlines Dublin's housing programs over the next five year period. Programs are linked with goals and policies as well as the identified housing needs which they address. For appropriate programs, quantified objectives over the next five year term (into 1995) are stated. Programs are also linked with potential funding sources, and those agencies or City officials responsible for implementation.

HOUSING OBJECTIVES

The objectives for the City's housing programs are both qualitative and quantitative. Quantitative objectives, where applicable, are identified for each program both under "Housing Program Description". Quantitative objectives are related to the overall quantitative targets identified for the City and the region in ABAG's Housing Needs Determinations report.

Below is a summary of the City's housing needs during the five year planning period (ABAG).

Number of Units Needed for 1990 - 1995

Very Low	678
Low	475
Moderate	499
Above Moderate	<u>819</u>
Total Projected Need	2,471

The total number of projected units within the existing city limits in the five year planning period is 1,905, as summarized below.

	Multi-Family	Single Family	Total
Vacant Sites	95	107	202
Projects Under Construction	436	210	646
Redevelopment Sites (Downtown)	200	0	200
Extended Planning Area	<u>475</u>	<u>372-382</u>	<u>847-857</u>
Total Units	1,206	689-699	1,895-1,905

Thus, the total projected unmet demand during the five year planning period is approximately 566 units. However, after 1995, proposed developments in East Dublin and West Dublin would supply adequate total numbers of units to meet the demand.

Unmet needs during the five year planning period are expected to be concentrated in the low and very low income categories. In 1988 and 1989, 24% of the units produced in Dublin were affordable to moderate income families and the remaining 76% were affordable only to above moderate income households (Planning Department, 1990). Applying these percentages to the projected number of units during the planning period results in the following number of projected new units and projected unmet needs:

	Projected Units	Housing Needs (ABAG)	Projected Unmet Needs	Quantified Objectives*	Programs
Very low	-0-	678	-678	285	IB/ID/IIIH
Low	-0-	475	-475	170	ID/IIIA/IIID/IIIF
Moderate	457	499	- 42	570	IA/IIIA/IIIB/IIIC/ IIID/IIIF
Above Mod	<u>1,448</u>	<u>819</u>	<u>+629</u>	<u>880</u>	IIIA
	1,905	2,471	-566	1,905	

In addition to the quantified objectives for new housing units, there are objectives for housing rehabilitation and preservation. The quantified objective for Alameda County's Minor Home Repair and Housing Rehabilitation Programs is 25 units (refer to Program (III.M.) There is also a quantified objective to preserve the 36 existing Section 8 units at The Springs Apartments.

Thus, given the recent housing production in Dublin and the projected number of units, the housing need of the very low, low and above moderate income families are not expected to be met during the five-year planning period. For example, even if 90 units affordable to very low and low income families were constructed at Arroyo Vista, a total of 1,063 units would be needed to satisfy the housing needs of these income categories. Thus, the programs emphasize housing assistance to very low and low income families.

HOUSING PROGRAM FUNDING SOURCES

State law recognizes the various realistic limitations which keep housing needs from being met. These include the limitations of private market-driven housing development, environmental limitations on land use, and a lack of adequate federal and state funding for housing assistance programs.

Housing program funding is a key factor for many of the programs outlined in this section. The City must be realistic in setting numerical objectives for programs which require funding. Thus, the

program objectives set forth below are subject to available funding, and are set at a realistic level based on expectations of non-guaranteed funding.

Below is a discussion of potential program funding sources. This is not intended as an exclusive listing of funding. Other sources, as they may become available, will be pursued by the City.

- A. **City General Fund** - Can be applied at the City's discretion to any program. The amount of funds available which are not already obligated to other City services and operations will be limited.
- B. **City Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds** - Annual allocation expected to be approximately \$40,000, depending on the continuation of this federal program.
- C. **Urban County CDBG Operational Funds** - As long as the City is a "non-entitlement City", the City's participation under the County's "Urban County" CDBG program should continue. This affiliation provides a percentage of funding for the Alameda County Housing and Community Development's operation of a variety of programs available to apply within the City.
- D. **Dublin Housing Authority Operational Funds** - The Dublin Housing Authority receives no funds from anyone to operate the Arroyo Vista project. Operating expenses are paid for from operating income. The federal government paid for the construction of the project only.
- E. **Special Federal/State Project Funding** - The federal and state governments provide funds for a variety of specified programs. Some are on a continuing basis. For example, federal funds for Section 8 certificates or housing vouchers are provided by HUD to local housing authorities. Some are limited, one-time grants for specific purposes. Examples of the latter are State Propositions 77 and 84, which through sale of State bonds will generate one-time funds which can be applied to owner-occupied or rental rehabilitation (Proposition 77), or for new construction, emergency shelters, or limited rehabilitation (Proposition 84).
- F. **Lending Institution Housing Funds** - Private lending institutions in California have created various funds earmarked for affordable housing. These include SAMCO (Savings Association Mortgage Co.), a savings and loan institutional fund; CCRC (California Community Reinvestment Corp.), a bank fund; and a fund created through FIRREA, the federal savings and loan "bail-out" program. the money available through these funds is required to be spent in a way to lower the finance costs of housing production or rehabilitation. and therefore increase affordability. It cannot be spent for administration or for support services related to housing. Money will also be allocated only on a project-by-project basis, and therefore cannot be guaranteed for programs.

HOUSING PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The following describes a range of housing programs to be implemented by the City of Dublin. Several of the programs will be accomplished through adoption of new regulations. Others require additional City action for implementation. Still others assume ongoing City efforts based on existing programs.

I. STRATEGIES REQUIRING ADOPTION OF NEW REGULATIONS

- A. Adopt an ordinance allowing density bonuses in excess of those called for by state law (e.g., a 30% bonus for 20% of the units set aside for lower-income/senior citizen households). The State legislature recently adopted AB 1863 which amends the density bonus law (Government Code Section 65915). The bill requires cities to grant a density bonus of at least 25 percent, and an additional incentive, or financially equivalent incentive(s), to a developer of a housing development agreeing to construct at least 1) 20% of the units for lower-income households; or 2) 10% of the units for very low-income households; or 3) 50% of the units for senior citizens.

Policy Objective: Provide incentives for affordable units

Quantified Objective: 100 units affordable to moderate income households

Actions to be

Undertaken: Adopt ordinance; inform developers of density bonuses; and require developers who are granted a density bonus to enter into an Affordable Housing Agreement with the City to ensure the continued affordability of the units

Financing: Minor administrative cost to City (A)

Implementation

Responsibility: Planning Department, Planning Commission and City Council

Time Frame: 1991 (adopt ordinance)

- B. Adopt an inclusionary zoning ordinance requiring a minimum percentage (e.g., 10%) of low and moderate income housing in new developments with 20 or more units. Such an ordinance could include:

- income-eligibility criteria for defining affordability;
- pricing criteria for affordable units;

- restrictions on resale and re-rental of affordable units;
- provisions for in-lieu fees;
- other provisions regarding on-site or off-site construction requirements and transfer of excess affordable housing credits;
- time limit within which any in-lieu fees must be spent; and
- incentives, such as fee waivers, priority processing and reduced site design standards.

Any in lieu fees collected under the program will go into an exclusive fund to be spent directly on creating new affordable housing opportunities in Dublin (i.e., fees could be paid to the City in lieu of the direct provision of affordable units). Such in-lieu fees usually are required to be spent within a limited time frame (e.g., three years) and could be used for landbank, rent writedowns, etc.

Policy Objective: Require the development of lower income housing

Quantified Objective: 190 units (affordable to low and very low income households)

Actions to be Undertaken: Adopt an inclusionary ordinance

Financing: Minor administrative cost (A)

Implementation Responsibility: Planning Department, Planning Commission and City Council

Time frame: 1991 (adopt ordinance)

- C. Review development standards to determine whether changes should be made to reduce development costs. The Joint Venture for Affordable Housing (JVAH) provides technical assistance to local governments interested in modifying development standards to encourage the construction of affordable housing. Site planning and building innovations can cut the costs of housing construction. Changes in site design which result in higher densities or reduced parking requirements can significantly reduce construction costs. Caution must be taken to avoid increasing liability.

Policy Objective: Modify development standards to encourage the construction of affordable housing

Actions to be
Undertaken:

Contact JVAH to obtain information on design and land use techniques to reduce development costs; and review City codes for unnecessary or costly requirements which contribute to construction costs

Financing:

Minor administrative cost (A)

Implementation
Responsibility:

Planning Department, Planning Commission and City Council

Time frame:

1992 (adopt any necessary changes to City regulations)

- D. Encourage the use of air rights over parking lots and sites with low intensity land uses to build housing. Air rights projects have no land costs, and because land is a major cost of housing development, air rights projects can be significantly less expensive. However, additional design and construction costs may reduce some of the cost savings.

Policy Objective:

Provide affordable housing through reduced land costs

Actions to be
Undertaken:

Initiate a study to determine the feasibility of using air rights downtown (as encouraged by the Downtown Specific Plan) and/or above public parking lots; amend the Zoning Ordinance and rezone the sites, if necessary to allow use of air rights for housing

Financing:

Minor administrative cost (A)

Implementation
Responsibility:

Planning Department

Time frame:

1992 (complete study)

- E. Encourage higher density residential development near the proposed Dublin BART station. Higher densities can improve the affordability of housing because per unit land costs are lower and construction can be performed more efficiently. Density increases near employment centers and transit nodes can also help to reduce traffic congestion.

Policy Objective: Improve housing affordability with higher densities near BART

Actions to be Undertaken: Initiate a study to determine the feasibility of increasing densities near the proposed BART station; rezone surrounding properties, if appropriate

Financing: Minor administrative cost

Implementation Responsibility: Planning Department

Time frame: 1992 (complete study); 1993 (rezonings)

- F. Adopt an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance allowing emergency shelters in multi-family zoning districts as a conditional use. To ensure that the regulatory process does not discourage the development of, or conversion to, or use of an emergency shelter for homeless persons, the Zoning Ordinance should be amended to allow emergency shelters in multi-family zoning districts with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit.

Policy Objective: Allow emergency shelter for the homeless

Actions to be Undertaken: Adopt amendment to Zoning Ordinance

Financing: Minor Administrative Cost to the City (A)

Implementation Responsibility: Planning Department, Planning Commission and City Council

Time Frame: 1992 (adopt ordinance)

II. STRATEGIES REQUIRING OTHER CITY ACTION FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- A. Provide priority processing for senior housing projects and developments providing 10% or more units affordable for very low, low and moderate income households. Developers estimate that every month required for processing adds at least 1% to 2% to the overall project cost (Local Housing Element Assistance Project, 1989).

Policy Objective: Simplify and coordinate the means of obtaining project approvals for senior projects and those with below market rate units

Actions to be Undertaken: Review senior housing projects and developments with units affordable for very low, low and moderate income households in advance of other pending applications; give applicants for these projects the opportunity to meet informally with City staff to present proposals and get early feedback before submitting formal applications

Financing: Minor administrative cost (A)

Implementation Responsibility: Planning Department

Time frame: Ongoing implementation

- B. Reduce application fees for senior housing projects and developments providing 10% or more units affordable for very low, low and moderate income households. To encourage the use of fee waivers, a policy should be adopted stating the City's willingness and procedures for waiving fees. This would provide the City with an opportunity to encourage the inclusion of affordable housing in new developments.

Policy Objective: Use fee waivers to encourage the development of affordable housing

Actions to be Undertaken: Review all planning fees and determine which can be waived

Financing: Minor administrative cost (A)

Implementation Responsibility: Planning Department, Planning Commission and City Council

Time frame: 1992 (complete study)

- C. Encourage shared living arrangements. Shared living occurs when people live together for social contact, mutual support and assistance, and/or to reduce housing expenses. State law requires that small shared living facilities (serving six or fewer persons) be permitted in all single family and multi-family districts.

Policy Objective: Encourage reduction of housing expenses through shared living arrangements

Actions to be Undertaken:

Work with ECHO and/or the Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development to establish a County-wide shared housing referral and placement program primarily for low-income residents. Outreach could be conducted through the senior center, libraries, City Hall and the media.

Financing: Minor administrative cost; and CDBG funds (A, B and C)

Implementation Responsibility: Planning Department

Time frame: 1992 (implement referral and replacement program)

- D. Work with the owner of The Springs and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to encourage the parties to negotiate a renewal of the Section 8 program; if necessary, work with a non-profit entity to consider the acquisition of the project and maintain the rent subsidies. Government Code Section 65583(a)(8) enacted in 1989 requires that the Housing Element include an analysis of existing housing developments that are eligible to change to non low-income housing uses during the next 10 years due to termination of subsidy contracts, mortgage prepayment, or expiration of use restrictions (refer to Section 6.2 of the Housing Element).

Policy Objective: Preserve low income housing

Quantified Objective: 36 units (very low and low)

Actions to be Undertaken:

Contact owner of The Springs to discuss options and encourage renewal of the contract; if the owner opts out of the contract, work with a non-profit entity to acquire The Springs Apartments and provide equivalent rent subsidies.

Financing: Minor administrative cost to City (A)

Implementation
Responsibility:

Planning Department, Planning
Commission and City Council

Time Frame: 1990

- E. Fund existing emergency shelter programs in the Tri-Valley area to house citizens in need of emergency shelter. Ninety-two people who were either residents of Dublin or transients, spent 756 bed nights in Tri-Valley emergency shelters in 1989 (survey by City of Dublin). The services cost those shelters and the citizens of Alameda County \$24,100. Support of these shelters by Dublin will be necessary to defray these costs.

Policy Objectives: Support existing emergency shelter programs in the Tri-Valley area.

Actions to be
Undertaken:

1. Review all Federal and State funding sources (such as the McKinney Program and the Emergency Shelter Program - AB 2579) and apply for necessary funding.
2. Consider providing financial assistance to the existing motel voucher system administered by the Good Samaritan Committee.
3. Consider providing funding and/or personnel support to encourage churches in Dublin to provide winter relief to homeless persons in the form of food and shelter.

Financing: Federal, State, local and private funds (A, B, C and E)

Implementation
Responsibility:

Planning Department, Planning
Commission and City Council

Time Frame: 1991

III. STRATEGIES REQUIRING ONGOING CITY EFFORT USING EXISTING PROGRAMS

- A. Annex and rezone additional land for residential use. The inventory of land suitable for residential development (Section 6.1.3) includes two areas within the extended planning area (East Dublin and West Dublin) which the City is currently considering annexing and

rezoning for residential development. These areas are currently zoned for agricultural use and are designated for residential/open space use in the General Plan. The proposed zoning densities for these annexation areas have not been determined.

Policy Objective: Increase total number of units produced in Dublin by providing additional sites for residential use

Quantified Objective: 350 units (affordable to low, moderate and above moderate households)

Action Undertaken: Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) and General Plan Amendment Studies currently being prepared for both areas

Actions Needed: Annexation of areas into City and adoption of General Plan Amendments, rezonings, specific plans and site development reviews

Financing: No cost to City

Implementation Responsibility: Dublin Planning Commission and City Council

Time Frame: 1992 (Annexation may be completed)
1993 (specific plans and site development reviews may be completed)

- B. Treat one-bedroom and studio units as equivalent to 75% of a housing unit when computing allowable density, provided that the maximum number of units permitted on a site shall not be increased by more than 25%.

Policy Objective: Avoid unintentional incentive to build large units; increase profitability of small lower cost units; and provide additional incentives to encourage low and moderate income housing

Quantified Objective: 100 units (affordable to moderate income households)

Action Undertaken: Flexible definition included in General Plan

Action Needed: Continue to inform developers that this policy is available.

Financing: Minor administrative cost to City

Implementation
Responsibility: Planning Department

Time Frame: Ongoing implementation

C. Encourage residential development in the Downtown Intensification Area.

Policy Objective: Increase units produced in Dublin; increase sites appropriate for affordable housing and accessible to downtown.

Quantified Objective: 200 units (affordable to moderate income households)

Action Undertaken: On July 21, 1987 the City Council adopted the Downtown Specific Plan which allows for residential uses (i.e., with approval of a use permit) in most of the downtown area.

Actions Needed: Contact residential developers to encourage joint venture projects with commercial developers; and grant additional incentives such as reduced site design standards, priority processing and fee reductions

Financing: Minor administrative cost to City (A)

Implementation
Responsibility: Planning Department

Time Frame: 1991 (adopt additional incentives) and 1992 (contact developers)

D. Support Semi-Public Institutions in Efforts to Add Affordable Housing to Their Sites. With public funding for the development of affordable housing extremely limited, the City will support efforts by semi-public institutions to provide housing. The Valley Christian Center, for example, is considering construction of senior housing on a portion of its property at the west end of Dublin Boulevard. To facilitate the center or any other land-owning institution in developing affordable housing on an appropriate site, the definition of the General Plan's "semi-public" designation makes provision for residential uses.

Policy Objective: Encourage development of affordable housing by private organizations not primarily engaged in housing construction or management

Quantified Objective: 90 units (affordable to low and moderate income households)

Action Undertaken: Inclusion of "Semi-public use" definition in the General Plan that allows housing

Actions to be Undertaken: Contact owners of semi-public property to inform them of this policy; and grant additional incentives such as reduced site design standards, priority processing and fee reductions

Financing: Minor administrative cost to City (A)

Implementing Responsibility: Planning Department

Time Frame: 1991 (adopt incentives) and 1992 (contact owners)

- E. Require a percentage of units in large multi-family projects (i.e., projects with more than 10 units) be rented for a specified period of time. The difficulties of first-time home buying make rental units the only affordable housing for many moderate income households that do not have the assets to make a down-payment on a home. Other households may chose to rent for other reasons.

Policy Objective: Insure availability of rental units in Dublin

Action Needed: Require that a minimum of 10% of the units in large multi-family projects be maintained as rental units for a period of five years.

Financing: No cost to City

Implementation
Responsibility: Planning Department, Planning
Commission and City Council

Time Frame: Ongoing implementation

- F. Encourage development of second units in existing single family homes. Given decreasing household size and the increasing cost of housing, second units added to or converted from single-family homes may be a way to use this housing resource to provide needed new housing at minimal financial and environmental costs. However, during the past five years, there have been only four requests for second units (all four requests were approved).

Policy Objective: Encourage efficient use of existing housing stock; promote development of small units at low cost

Quantified
Objective: 50 units (affordable to low and moderate income households)

Action Undertaken: Adoption of second unit ordinance

Actions to be
Undertaken: Consider reviewing the requirements for approval of second units; publicize and promote the program; and consider implementing a program to give City recognition to good designs for second units

Financing: Minor administrative cost to City (A)

Implementing
Responsibility: Planning Department and Planning
Commission

Time Frame: 1991 (review requirements) and 1992
(implement program)

- G. Cooperate with non-profit housing provider to develop units affordable to very low and low income households. Private non-profit housing organizations often have advantages in securing funds for development of housing as well as in reducing housing cost to the consumer. In

the Tri-Valley area, Eden Housing has been active in developing affordable housing, and has worked with the cities of Livermore, Hayward, Union City and Pleasanton as well as Alameda County. Other non-profit developers (e.g., BRIDGE and Volunteers of America) have also been active in the area, and may be interested in working in Dublin.

Policy Objective: Promote development of affordable housing in Dublin

Actions to be Undertaken: Contact Eden Housing and other non-profit housing providers to make them aware of development opportunities in Dublin; and annex and rezone land to provide development sites within East Dublin for this program

Financing: Minor administrative cost to City (A)

Implementation Responsibility: Planning Department

Time Frame: 1991 (contact providers) and 1993 (provide sites)

- H. Encourage development of additional units on Housing Authority land in Dublin. The Arroyo Vista site includes approximately six acres of undeveloped land on two parcels suitable for additional development. One parcel (approximately four acres) is being considered for a senior housing project or a low income project for families. The other parcel contains approximately two acres.

Policy Objective: Promote development of units affordable to very low income households

Quantified Objective: 95 units (affordable to very low income households)

Actions Undertaken: The Dublin Housing Authority has retained a consultant to study the feasibility of the two projects.

Actions to be Undertaken: Provide priority processing and reduced application fees; change development standards; if appropriate

Financing: Housing Authority fund and minor administrative cost to City (A and D)

Implementation
Responsibility: Housing Authority and Planning Department

Time frame: Ongoing implementation

- I. Monitor Availability of Rental Housing. If deemed necessary, consider enactment of condominium conversion ordinance. Only one condominium conversion project has been approved by the City. The developer did not follow through with implementation of the project.

Policy Objective: Assist in maintaining rental stock as housing affordable to moderate income Dublin households

Actions to be
Undertaken: After an application for a condominium conversion is received by the City, evaluate the City-wide rental vacancy rate; pass a condominium conversion ordinance, if necessary

Financing: Minor administrative cost to City (A)

Implementation
Responsibility: Planning Department

Time Frame: Ongoing implementation

- J. Require evidence of developer effort to receive public financial assistance for purpose of including below market rate units in proposed projects; and assist developers in obtaining information on available programs. The range of available state and federal programs designed to increase housing affordability varies from year to year. To insure that developers are participating in appropriate programs when possible, the City will require evidence that developers of multi-family housing have investigated program availability and are using available assistance whenever possible. To reduce the burden on developers created by this requirement, the City will prepare a packet of information on available programs, including a list of agency contact persons responsible for program implementation. This information will be given to developers as early as possible in the project approval process. This requirement will apply only to developers of projects that contain 75 or more multi-family units.

Policy Objective: Promote use of available funds and funding mechanisms in private sector housing development

Actions to be Undertaken: Collect and prepare information for developers, develop review process for implementation

Financing: Minor administrative cost to City (A

Implementation Responsibility: Planning Department

Time Frame: 1992 (information development, ongoing implementation)

- K. Promote equal housing opportunity for all Dublin residents and others seeking housing in Dublin. Operation Sentinel, a fair housing program of the Urban Coalition established in 1971, provides fair housing services, landlord-tenant counseling, and rental mediation. It also seeks to educate both the real estate industry and community citizens as well as investigate and/or refer housing complaints. In the Tri-Valley, the Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO) provides services to victims of housing discrimination. Services are provided to Dublin residents through the organization's Livermore office.

Policy Objective: Support services and programs which fight housing discrimination; direct persons towards agencies which provide assistance to victims of discrimination

Actions To Be Undertaken: Continue using a portion of the City's CDBG funding has been used support ECHO

Financing: Minor administrative cost to City

Implementation Responsibility: Planning Department

Time frame: 1992 (information development, ongoing implementation)

- L. Promote energy conservation. In reviewing and approving site plans, the City can assure that new developments will have energy efficient design.

Policy Objective: Promote energy efficiency in new projects

Actions to be
Undertaken: Prior to project approval, require
developers to demonstrate that solar
orientation and access have been
considered in site design

Financing: No cost to City

Implementation
Responsibility: Planning Department

Time frame: Ongoing implementation

- M. Support Alameda County's Minor Home Repair and Housing
Rehabilitation Programs. A portion of the City's CDBG
funds are currently being used to support two housing
rehabilitation programs administered by the Alameda
County Department of Housing and Community Development.

Policy Objective: Provide subsidies for housing
rehabilitation

Quantified
Objective: 25 units

Actions Undertaken: In 1989, a total of \$3,559 from a
total budget of \$12,100 was expended
in Dublin from the Minor Home Repair
Program and \$38,180 was expended from
the Housing Rehabilitation Program

Actions to be
Undertaken: Continue to use City CDBG funds to
support the rehabilitation programs
at levels similar to the past

Financing: City CDBG funds (B)

Implementation
Responsibility: Planning Department

Time frame: Ongoing implementation

N. Participate in the Alameda County Mortgage Credit Certification (MCC) Program. Through the use of a MCC, eligible first-time home buyers increase their eligibility to qualify for a mortgage loan and reduce their effective mortgage interest rate approximately 2 percentage points. MCC recipients may take 20% of their annual mortgage interest payments as a dollar for dollar tax credit against their federal income taxes. The home buyer adjusts federal income tax withholdings, increasing income available to pay the mortgage. Under the program, the City currently has two reservations issued worth \$230,900 and seven MCC's remaining worth \$769,100.

Policy Objective: Increase the eligibility of first time home buyers to qualify for mortgage loans

Actions Undertaken: On January 23, 1989, the City indicated its interest in participating in the MCC Program. Two reservations for Dublin residents have been issued.

Actions to be Undertaken: Continue participation in the program

Financing: Minor administrative cost

Implementation Responsibility: Planning Department

Time frame: Ongoing implementation

6.4 CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS (65300.5)

Government Code Section 65300.5 requires that the general plan and its elements comprise an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies of the City. The other elements of the General Plan are being revised in conjunction with the preparation of the revised Housing Element. Revisions will be required to Section 1.0 (Background), 2.0 (Land Use Element) and 6.0 (Housing Element Summary) of the Dublin General Plan.

6.5 DESCRIPTION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION EFFORTS [65351 and 65583(c)6]

Government Code Sections 65351 and 65583(c)(6) require that during the preparation of an amendment to the general plan, the City must provide opportunities for the involvement of citizens, public agencies, and civic, education, and other community groups. Community meetings were held on March 5 and 6, 1990, to explain the statutory requirements of the housing element and to solicit citizen input on the housing problems and issues facing the city. Public Notice of the meetings was posted in public buildings, published in the Valley Times, advertised on Viacom Channel 30 and mailed to:

1. the Southern Alameda County Board of Realtors,
2. the Southern Alameda County Apartment Owners Association,
3. the Bay Area Council,
4. the Alameda County Housing Authority,
5. the manager of the Arroyo Vista housing project,
6. all homeowners associations in the City, and
7. the Chamber of Commerce membership list.

The following issues were discussed at the public meetings:

1. the appropriateness of the housing goals, objectives, and policies in the 1985 Housing Element;
2. the effectiveness of the Housing Element in attainment of Dublin's housing goals and objectives;
3. the progress of Dublin in implementing the Housing Element;
4. Dublin's housing needs that can be met over the next five years;
5. what existing and new goals, objectives, policies and programs should be included in the revised Housing Element.

Questionnaires were filled out by all in attendance. The input received at the meetings was considered in the preparation of the Housing Element.

6.6 EVALUATION OF 1985 HOUSING ELEMENT [65588]

Government Code Section 65588 requires that the Housing Element evaluate:

1. the appropriateness of the housing goals, objectives and policies in contributing to the state housing goal;
2. the effectiveness of the Housing Element in attainment of Dublin's housing goals and objectives; and
3. the progress of the City in implementation of the 1985 Housing Element.

The 1985 Housing Element did not include development in Hansen Hill, Donlan Canyon, East Dublin and West Dublin. This omission was due to the fact that development of these areas was not projected within the five year timeframe of the 1985 Housing Element.

The 1985 Housing Element projected that the City would be built-out by 1995. However, due to the future development of these four areas which contain approximately 11,144 acres, build-out will not occur by 1995.

One of the major policy goals of the 1985 Housing Element was to produce more units and greater variety in unit types than would be achieved if previous policies were continued. Under Alameda County policies, most of Dublin's residential land was zoned for single family detached houses. Therefore, many of the strategies in the 1985 Housing Element were intended to increase residentially zoned land in the city and raise permitted residential densities (i.e., higher densities generally result in smaller units and lower land costs per unit).

The 1985 Housing Element projected construction of half of the City's remaining dwelling units (which was 950 units at that time), during the five year planning period. It also projected that over 70% of these would be multi-family units.

Between January 1985 and January 1990, a total of 2,645 housing units were constructed, including 1,011 additional single family units and 1,634 multi-family units. Approximately 56% of the new housing units were multi-family (compared to 7% projected). There was an increase in multi-family units within the City from 9% of the total housing stock in 1985 to 29% in 1990.

Below are each of the housing strategies from the 1985 Housing Element followed by a discussion of actions taken since 1985 to implement each strategy.

Increase Residential Densities.

Policy Objective: Allow construction at higher densities to increase number of units constructed and lower land price per unit.

Quantified Objective: Additional 250 units within five years; at buildout 500 units above number that would be produced under previous policies.

Discussion: The 1985 General Plan changed the land use designation of the 79 acre area at the northwest corner of Amador Valley Boulevard and Dougherty Road (i.e., the Villages 2 - 7) from single family residential to medium density with required mixed dwelling types, including single family detached and permitting up to 25 units per acre on portions of the site. Under the single family residential land use designation (i.e., which allows 0.9 to 6.0 units per acre), the maximum allowable density would have permitted up to a total of 474 units. The Villages projects which have been approved by the City provide a total of 1,084 dwelling units, including 939 multi-family units and 145 single family units, as shown below.

	Single-family	Multi-family
Village 2		248
Village 3		216
Village 4		135
Village 5		204
Village 6	145	-
Village 7		136
Total	145	939

The change in land use designation on the Villages 2 - 7 resulted in at least 610 additional units compared to the previous single family residential designation on the site.

Thus, the objective of 250 units during the planning period was exceeded by 360 units.

Designate Additional Land for Residential Use.

Policy Objective: Increase total number of units produced in Dublin by providing additional sites for residential development.

Quantified Objective: 93 units over next five years.

Discussion: The 1985 Housing Element identified five sites available for development of housing which were not designated for residential use at that time. Of the five sites identified, four were designated for residential use during the planning period, as

shown below (the quantified objectives shown below are from the Land Use Element of the General Plan, which pertain to build-out of the City).

Area	# of Units Approved by the City			Quantified Objective
	Multi-family	Single Family	Total	
Village 1	56	-	56	56 - 100
Fallon School	-	17	17	8 - 48
Vista Green Terrace	-	88	88	22 - 88
Valley Christian Center *	-	-	-	N/A
Downtown **	-	-	-	200
Total			161	286 - 436

* The zoning on the Valley Christian Center property has not been changed. The property owner has not submitted a proposal for a housing project to the City.

** On July 21, 1987 the City Council adopted the Downtown Specific Plan which allows for residential uses (i.e., with approval of a use permit) in most of the downtown area (refer to page 37 of the plan). The plan encourages residential uses above the ground floor. To date, there have been no proposals submitted to the City for residential projects within the downtown area.

There was one site which was not identified in the 1985 Housing Element that received approval for additional housing units during the planning period. On February 27, 1989, the City Council approved a General Plan Amendment for Hansen Hill Ranch (west of Silvergate Drive) which allows increased density. The approved PD Rezoning allows 110 units compared to 72 units allowed under the previous land use designation.

In conclusion, the quantified objective for the planning period was exceeded by 106 units (i.e., 199 additional units achieved compared to 93 projected).

Treat One-bedroom and Studio Units as Equivalent to 75 Percent of a Housing Unit When Computing Allowable Density, Provided that the Maximum Number of Units Permitted on a Site Shall not be Increased by More Than 25 Percent.

Policy Objective: Avoid unintentional incentive to build large units; increase profitability of small, lower cost units.

Discussion: The Planning Department staff has informed developers of large projects that this policy was available. However, developers of projects such as the Villages and Amador Lakes decided not to request increased densities because the land use regulations allowed the number of units proposed.

Allow Residential Development in the Downtown Intensification Area.

Policy Objective: Increase units produced in Dublin; increase sites appropriate for affordable housing and accessible to downtown.

Quantified Objective: 200 units

Discussion: This policy was included in the Dublin Downtown Specific Plan which was adopted by the City in 1987. To date there have been no proposals submitted for residential development in the downtown area. This strategy is discussed in more detail above under the heading "Designate Additional Land for Residential Use". The program is augmented in the revised Housing Element by providing additional development incentives.

Support Semi-Public Institutions in Efforts to Add Affordable Housing on Their Sites.

Policy Objective: Encourage development of affordable housing by private organizations not primarily engaged in housing construction or management.

Discussion: The City has not received any proposals from private organizations for affordable housing projects. The City should actively work with developers to make them aware of affordable housing projects which have been implemented in other Bay area cities. The program is augmented in the revised Housing Element by providing additional development incentives.

Require a Percentage of Units in Large Multi-family Projects to be Rented for a Specified Period of Time.

Policy Objective: Insure availability of rental units in the City.

Discussion: The majority of recent multi-family projects have been rented during the initial occupancy phase.

Encourage Development of Second Units in Existing Single Family Homes.

Policy Objective: Encourage efficient use of existing housing stock; promote development of small units at low cost.

Quantified Objective: 350 second units.

Discussion: The 1985 Housing Element overstated the demand for this type of unit. During the past five years, there have been only four requests for approval of second units in the City. All four of the applications were approved. Due to the lack of requests for approval of second units, the quantified objective was not met (i.e., 346 additional second units would be required to meet the objective).

To make this program more effective, the City should consider relaxing the requirements for approval of second units. In addition, the City should publicize and promote the program. One option would be to implement a program to give City recognition to good designs for second units.

Cooperate with Non-Profit Housing Provider to Develop Below-Market Rate Units.

Policy Objective: Promote development of affordable housing.

Discussion: During the planning period, the City did not receive any proposals for housing projects by non-profit groups. The City should actively work with non-profit housing providers such as Eden Housing and BRIDGE to make them aware of development opportunities in Dublin. The program is also augmented in the revised Housing Element by providing additional development incentives.

Work with Pleasanton Toward Establishing a Joint Housing Authority.

Policy Objective: Share control of Housing Authority activities in Dublin; support housing information and referral services.

Discussion: In 1986 the Dublin Housing Authority was formed and the title to the Arroyo Vista project, Dublin's only public housing project, was transferred from the City of Pleasanton Housing Authority to the City of Dublin Housing Authority. The management of Arroyo Vista was transferred from the Pleasanton Housing Authority to the Alameda County Housing Authority. This action made it unnecessary to establish a joint housing authority.

The Dublin Housing Authority includes two residents of Arroyo Vista as well as the full membership of the City Council. The Housing Authority generally meets once a month.

Encourage the Development of Additional Units on Housing Authority Land in Dublin.

Policy Objective: Promote development of below market-rate units affordable to low income households.

Discussion: The Arroyo Vista site includes two vacant parcels of undeveloped land suitable for development. The first parcel (approximately three acres) is being considered for a senior housing project with up to 75 units. The other parcel (approximately two acres) is being considered for a low income project with up to 20 units. Recently, the Dublin Housing Authority retained a consultant to study the feasibility of the two projects.

Encourage Development of Rental Housing. If deemed Necessary, Consider Enactment of Condominium Conversion Ordinance.

Policy Objective: Assist in maintaining rental stock as housing affordable to moderate income Dublin households.

Discussion: Only one condominium conversion project has been approved by the City. The developer did not follow through with implementation of the project.

Consequently, the City does not have a program for ongoing monitoring of rental vacancy rates (i.e., there is no need for continuous monitoring due to the low interest in condominium conversions). However, after an application for a condominium conversion is received by the City, the City-wide rental vacancy rate is evaluated as part of the review process.

Require Evidence of Developer Effort to Receive Public Financial Assistance for the Purpose of Including Below Market Rate Units in Proposed Projects; Assist Developers in Obtaining Information on Available Programs.

Policy Objective: Promote use of available funds and funding mechanisms in private sector housing development.

Discussion: The Planning Department staff has monitored available public financial assistance programs for below market rate units. To reduce the burden on developers created by this requirement, the City will prepare a packet of information on available programs, including a list of agency contact persons responsible for program implementation. This information will be given to developers as early as possible in the project approval process. This requirement applies only to developers of projects that contain 75 or more multi-family units. The program is augmented in the revised Housing Element by providing additional development incentives.

Grant 25 Percent Density Bonuses for Provision of 25 Percent Affordable Units as Required by State Law.

Policy Objective: Provision of incentives for providing affordable units; compliance with State law.

Discussion: No developers have requested density bonuses. A revised program will consider an additional density bonus and other incentives for producing affordable housing.

Promote Equal Housing Opportunity for All Dublin Residents and Others Seeking Housing in Dublin.

Policy Objective: Support services and programs which fight housing discrimination; direct persons towards agencies which provide assistance to victims of discrimination as needed.

Discussion: The City participates in the Alameda County small cities block grant program which provides assistance to the Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO). ECHO provides services to victims of housing discrimination.

Continue City Code Enforcement Program; Aid Low Income Households in Obtaining Financial Assistance for Housing Rehabilitation.

Policy Objective: Enforce building and zoning codes.

Discussion: The City does not have a systematic code enforcement program. Existing units are inspected only when complaints are received by the City. If code violations are discovered, owners are only required to make improvements which bring the property up to minimum code requirements.

The City provides information to the public regarding the Alameda County Home Improvement Loan Program which is administered by the Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development. The program provides low interest home improvement loans to homeowners who have low or moderate incomes. The City of Dublin is participating in the funding of this program with funds from the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program.

Promote Opportunities for Energy Conservation.

During the five year planning period, the percentage of multi-family units in the City has increased from 9% to 29%. Multi-family units are energy efficient due to minimal exterior walls. In addition, developers of large residential projects have been required to demonstrate that solar orientation has been considered.

CONCLUSION

The quantified objectives for the five year planning period were exceeded by 120 units. Below is a summary of the quantified objectives from the 1985 Housing Element and the additional units that resulted during the planning period.

	Objective	Additional Units	Difference
Increase densities	250	610	+360
Designate additional land	93	199	+106
Encourage second units	350	4	-346
Total	693	813	+120

Below is a list of the projects which were included in the 1985 Housing Element. It includes the total number of approved or potential units and their status as of February 1990 (Appendix C contains a map showing the location of each project):

SITES CURRENTLY ZONED FOR RESIDENTIAL USE:

Map # & Name	Total # of Units		Building	Occupied
	Single- family	Multi- family	Permits Issued	

Site 1

19	Village 2	248		248
20	Village 3	216	216	0
21	Village 4	135	SDR approved PC 8/15/88, building permits have not been issued.	
22	Village 5	204	204	163
24	Village 7	136	136	102

Site 2 *

17	Arroyo Vista	Per City's Development Policies, a range of 42 to 95 additional multi-family units are possible		
----	--------------	---	--	--

Site 3

12	Coral Gate	26	26	26
----	------------	----	----	----

Site 4

9	Pulte Homes	25	25	25
---	-------------	----	----	----

Site 5

4 acres - Portion of Hansen Hill

Sites 6 and 7 *

Hansen Hill - 180 single family units are approved, but the Final Map(s) is not recorded.

SITES NOT CURRENTLY DESIGNATED FOR RESIDENTIAL USE:

Site 8

18 Village 1	56	56	56
--------------	----	----	----

Site 9 *

13a Brighton Meadows (Fallon School Site - 17 single family units are approved, but the Final Map has not been recorded)

Site 11

2 Vista Green Potential for 18 - 42 multi-family units

Site 12 *

Valley Christian Center - plans have not been submitted to the City.

Site 13 *

Downtown Intensification Area - plans have not been submitted to the City.

* Projects identified in the 1985 Housing Element which are currently vacant but could provide housing during the five year planning period (1990 - 1995). Below is a summary of those projects and the number of additional units they could provide.

	Approximate Acreage	Potential # of Units
Site 2	5	42 - 95 multi-family
Sites 6 and 7	147	180 single family
Site 9	8	17 single family
Site 12	6	21 single family
Site 13	Unknown	200 multi-family
Total	166	469 - 513 units

In 1988 and 1989, 24% of the unites produced in Dublin were affordable to moderate income families and the remaining 76% were affordable only to above moderate income households (Planning Department, 1990). Applying these percentages to the total number of units constructed between 1985 and 1990, results in the following distribution of housing units affordable to the various income categories (compared to the City's quantified objectives and the regional share allocation for the same period):

	<u>Units Constructed</u>	<u>Housing Needs (ABAG)</u>	<u>Quantified Objectives</u>
Very Low	0	391	N/A
Low	0	274	N/A
Moderate	635	450	N/A
Above Moderate	<u>2,010</u>	<u>841</u>	<u>N/A</u>
TOTAL	2,645	1,956	950

The total number of units constructed between 1985 and 1990 exceeded the project need for housing units (ABAG, 1983) by 689 units and the City's quantified objectives by 1,695 units. However, no units were constructed which were affordable to very low or low income households.

Therefore, the programs in the updated (1990) Housing Element emphasize the achievement of housing affordable to very low and low income households. The following new programs have been included to better achieve the new construction needs of the very low and low income groups (refer to the Goals, Quantified Objectives, Policies and Housing Program Section):

- I.A. Adopt an ordinance allowing density bonuses in excess of those called for by State law (e.g., a 30% bonus for 20% of the units set aside for lower-income/senior citizen households).
- I.B. Adopt an inclusionary zoning ordinance requiring a minimum percentage (e.g., 10%) of low and moderate income housing in new developments with 20 or more units.
- I.C. Review development standards to determine whether changes should be made to reduce development costs.
- I.D. Encourage the use of air rights over parking lots and sites with low intensity land uses to build housing.
- I.E. Encourage higher density residential development near the proposed Dublin BART station.
- I.F. Adopt an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance allowing emergency shelters in multi-family zoning districts as a conditional use.

- II.A. Provide priority processing for senior housing projects and developments providing 10% units affordable to very low and low income households.
- II.B. Reduce application fees for senior housing projects and developments providing 10% or more units affordable to very low and low income households.
- II.C. Encourage shared living arrangements.
- II.D. Units at risk. Work with the owner of The Springs and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to encourage the parties to negotiate a renewal of the Section 8 program; if necessary, work with a non-profit entity to consider acquisition of the project and provide equivalent rent subsidies
- II.E. Fund existing emergency shelter programs in the Tri-Valley area to house citizens in need of emergency shelter.

APPENDIX A:

REFERENCES

6.1 ASSESSMENT AND INVENTORY

6.1.1. POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT TRENDS AND HOUSING NEEDS

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Housing Needs Determinations, January 1989.

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Projections '90, December 1989.

6.1.2 HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections '90, December 1989.

Basgal, Ophelia, Executive Director, Alameda County Housing Authority, January 9, 1990 - telephone communication.

Blayney-Dyett, City of Dublin Housing Element, September 10, 1984, printed January 1985.

California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, Alameda County Population and Housing Estimates for January 1, 1989, printed April 25, 1989.

City of Pleasanton and City of Livermore, Valley Human Services Directory, January 1989.

Farias, Cece, City of Dublin Building Department, January 22, 1990 - personal interview.

Kanalakis, Mike, Southern Alameda County Apartment Owners Association, January 29, 1990 - telephone communication.

Schriber, Larry, Key Financial Services, telephone communication, March 22, 1990.

Spano, Jeff, California Department of Housing and Community Development, telephone communication, March 21, 1990.

Southern Alameda County Board of Realtors, Monthly Sales Statistics (1983-1989).

U.S. Census Bureau, 1980 Census.

WPM Planning Team, Inc., West Dublin General Plan Amendment Specific Plan Study, Study Report 1: Environmental Setting/Planning Considerations, November 27, 1989.

WPM Planning Team, Memorandum dated February 12, 1990, ABAG's Revised Estimates For Dublin and Tri-Valley.

6.1.3 INVENTORY OF LAND SUITABLE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Dublin Planning Department, Recent Residential Projects, February 1990.

Gillarde, Brenda, Planning Consultant, City of Dublin Planning Department, telephone communication on February 15, 1990.

6.1.4 GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

City of Dublin Building Department, 1990.

City of Dublin Engineering Department, 1990.

City of Dublin Planning Department, 1990.

Kattan, Emil, Dublin-San Ramon Services, telephone communication on April 2, 1990.

Wallace, Roberts & Todd, East Dublin Specific Plan/General Plan Amendment Studies, 1990

6.1.5 NON-GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Bank of America, Bay Area Construction Cost Survey, 1987.

Economic Research Associates, Memorandum dated February 27, 1990 to Wallace, Roberts & Todd.

6.1.6 SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS

Cantelow, Alice Ann, Shepard's Gate, telephone communication on February 14, 1990.

Clouse, Deputy Doug, City of Dublin Police Department, telephone communication on February 15, 1990.

Dublin Planning Department, Survey of Emergency Shelter Providers in the Tri-Valley Area, March, 1990.

Emergency Services Network, 1989 Unduplicated Count Study.

Heverly, Earl, Valley Christian Center, telephone communication on February 14, 1990.

Homebase, Homelessness in the Bay Area: Ten Points, Spring, 1989.

U.S. Census Bureau, 1980 Census.

United Way of the Bay Area, Valleys Corridor Project, November, 1982.

6.1.7 OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION

City of Dublin, 1985 Housing Element.

6.2 HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS THAT ARE ELIGIBLE TO CHANGE TO NON-LOW-INCOME HOUSING USES

Basgal, Ophelia, Executive Director, Alameda County Housing Authority, March 8, 1990 - Telephone Communication.

California Coalition of Rural Housing Projects, Inventory of Federally Subsidized Low-Income Rental Units at Risk of Conversion, March 1, 1989.

Dross, Jach, Alameda County Housing Authority, May 9, 1990 - Telephone Communication.

Giordano, Neck, Administrator, The Springs, May 9, 1990 - Telephone Communication.

Truesdale, Tim, Eden Housing, telephone conversation, March 8, 1990.

6.3 GOALS, QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

Local Housing Element Assistance Project, Blueprint for Bay Area Housing, December, 1989.

6.4 CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS

6.5 DESCRIPTION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION EFFORTS

6.6 EVALUATION OF 1985 HOUSING ELEMENT

Association of Bay Area Governments, Housing Needs Determination, 1983.

City of Dublin, Planning Department, July, 1989, Recent Residential Projects.

Basgal, Ophelia, Executive Director, Alameda County Housing Authority, January 9, 1990 - telephone communication.

Rankin, Paul, Assistant City Manager, City of Dublin, January 8, 1990 - personal interview.

APPENDIX B

POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD AND EMPLOYMENT TABLES

ABAG'S POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD, EMPLOYMENT & INCOME PROJECTIONS
City of Dublin, Tri-Valley, Alameda County, San Francisco Bay Region
1980-2005

Year	Population	Households	Employed Residents	Total HH Income \$Mil	Total Employ.	Agri. & Mining	Mfg. & Wholesale	Retail Trade	Services	Other Jobs
CITY OF DUBLIN										
1980	15,299	4,039	6,497	\$182	8,168	52	1,196	3,173	1,567	2,180
1985	17,600	4,800	8,000	\$224	9,640	40	1,370	4,230	1,640	2,360
1990	25,500	7,100	12,000	\$349	12,210	10	2,230	5,100	2,410	2,460
1995	29,500	8,470	14,000	\$424	15,210	10	2,850	5,730	4,000	2,620
2000	37,100	10,940	17,500	\$575	17,880	10	3,430	6,920	4,670	2,850
2005	46,200	13,990	21,700	\$772	20,560	10	3,820	7,890	4,910	3,930
TRI-VALLEY CITIES + ALAMO-BLACKHAWK										
1980	160,367	51,386	76,876	\$2,714	48,775	1,126	7,313	10,773	17,222	12,341
1985	185,100	60,220	93,000	\$3,393	67,850	1,000	11,390	14,510	22,910	18,040
1990	235,600	79,500	124,800	\$4,742	106,580	1,080	18,770	21,440	36,810	28,480
1995	266,900	91,040	145,400	\$5,719	131,740	1,030	24,170	27,450	47,450	31,640
2000	297,900	103,780	165,400	\$6,785	160,800	970	36,330	32,720	56,700	34,080
2005	331,800	117,120	183,800	\$7,884	182,350	910	42,400	37,830	62,370	38,840
ALAMEDA COUNTY										
1980	1,105,379	426,093	522,069	\$15,173	511,158	4,682	118,016	82,609	151,675	154,176
1985	1,191,450	451,750	579,400	\$17,076	559,800	3,910	128,420	98,140	166,140	163,190
1990	1,272,000	491,610	647,500	\$19,714	622,400	3,270	143,430	115,320	183,170	177,210
1995	1,330,800	519,520	707,000	\$22,339	692,200	2,760	164,460	127,610	199,150	198,220
2000	1,387,900	547,320	752,400	\$24,684	740,600	2,280	179,490	131,060	216,660	211,110
2005	1,444,600	572,420	778,900	\$26,846	776,900	1,820	194,590	136,920	226,370	217,200
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION										
1980	5,179,789	1,970,551	2,552,894	\$78,302	2,535,155	38,561	614,580	398,039	710,885	773,090
1985	5,537,650	2,095,940	2,840,100	\$90,754	2,758,170	33,960	656,100	454,350	801,290	812,470
1990	5,950,950	2,284,080	3,162,800	\$105,524	3,073,280	33,660	690,150	525,460	942,190	881,820
1995	6,292,650	2,445,750	3,420,400	\$119,597	3,418,900	32,330	774,300	599,580	1,052,110	960,580
2000	6,610,500	2,595,440	3,631,200	\$133,665	3,705,980	30,190	850,720	653,150	1,151,570	1,020,350
2005	6,832,850	2,706,200	3,751,600	\$145,864	3,954,160	27,690	916,940	700,880	1,239,630	1,069,020

Note: All dollar values in "constant 1988 dollars".

Sources: ABAG Projections '90, December 1989.

City & County: Pages 76-93.

Region: Pages 26, 29, 33, 39.

File Ref: \Prj.Tools\ABAG\ABAG 4 2/12/90 page 1

AVERAGE ANNUAL CHANGES IN ABAG'S PROJECTIONS
City of Dublin, Tri-Valley, Alameda County, San Francisco Bay Region
1980-2005

Year	Population	Households	Employed Residents	Total HH Income \$Mil	Total Employ.	Agri. & Mining	Mfg. & Wholesale	Retail Trade	Services	Other Employ.
------	------------	------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------	----------------	------------------	--------------	----------	---------------

CITY OF DUBLIN
Average Annual Change ... 5 Year Periods

1980-85	460	152	301	\$8	294	(2)	35	211	15	36
1985-90	1,580	460	800	\$25	514	(6)	172	174	154	20
1990-95	800	274	400	\$15	600	0	124	126	318	32
1995-00	1,520	494	700	\$30	534	0	116	238	134	46
2000-05	1,820	610	840	\$39	536	0	78	194	48	216

% Change ... 1980 to 2005

1980-05	202%	246%	234%	325%	152%	-81%	219%	149%	213%	80%
---------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	-----

TRI-VALLEY CITIES + ALAMO-BLACKHAWK
Average Annual Change ... 5 Year Periods

1980-85	4,947	1,767	3,225	136	3,815	(25)	815	747	1,138	1,140
1985-90	10,100	3,856	6,360	270	7,746	16	1,476	1,386	2,780	2,088
1990-95	6,260	2,308	4,120	195	5,032	(10)	1,080	1,202	2,128	632
1995-00	6,200	2,548	4,000	213	5,812	(12)	2,432	1,054	1,850	488
2000-05	6,780	2,668	3,680	220	4,310	(12)	1,214	1,022	1,134	952

% Change ... 1980 to 2005

1980-05	107%	128%	139%	191%	274%	-19%	480%	251%	262%	215%
---------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

ALAMEDA COUNTY
Average Annual Change ... 5 Year Periods

1980-85	17,214	5,131	11,466	381	9,728	(154)	2,081	3,106	2,893	1,803
1985-90	16,110	7,972	13,620	527	12,520	(128)	3,002	3,436	3,406	2,804
1990-95	11,760	5,582	11,900	525	13,960	(102)	4,206	2,458	3,196	4,202
1995-00	11,420	5,560	9,080	469	9,680	(96)	3,006	690	3,502	2,578
2000-05	11,340	5,020	5,300	432	7,260	(92)	3,020	1,172	1,942	1,218

% Change ... 1980 to 2005

1980-05	31%	34%	49%	77%	52%	-61%	65%	66%	49%	41%
---------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	-----	-----	-----	-----

SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION
Average Annual Change ... 5 Year Periods

1980-85	71,572	25,078	57,441	2,490	44,603	(920)	8,304	11,262	18,081	7,876
1985-90	82,660	37,628	64,540	2,954	63,022	(60)	6,810	14,222	28,180	13,870
1990-95	68,340	32,334	51,520	2,815	69,124	(266)	16,830	14,824	21,984	15,752
1995-00	63,570	29,938	42,160	2,814	57,416	(428)	15,284	10,714	19,892	11,954
2000-05	44,470	22,152	24,080	2,440	49,636	(500)	13,244	9,546	17,612	9,734

% Change ... 1980 to 2005

1980-05	32%	37%	47%	86%	56%	-28%	49%	76%	74%	38%
---------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	-----	-----	-----	-----

Sources: See Table 1
File Ref: \Prj:Tools\ABAG\ABAG 4 2/12/90 page 2

PROJECTIONS: PERCENTAGE OF LARGER GEOGRAPHIC AREA
City of Dublin, Tri-Valley, Alameda County, San Francisco Bay Region
1980-2005

Year	Population	Households	Employed Residents	Total HH Income \$Mil	Jobs in Area					
					Total Employ.	Agri. & Mining	Mfg. & Wholesale	Retail Trade	Services	Other Employ.

CITY OF DUBLIN AS % OF TRI-VALLEY AREA

1980	9.54%	7.86%	8.45%	6.69%	16.75%	4.62%	16.35%	29.45%	9.10%	17.66%
1985	9.51%	7.97%	8.60%	6.59%	14.21%	4.00%	12.03%	29.15%	7.16%	13.08%
1990	10.82%	8.93%	9.62%	7.35%	11.46%	0.93%	11.88%	23.79%	6.55%	8.64%
1995	11.05%	9.30%	9.63%	7.42%	11.55%	0.97%	11.79%	20.87%	8.43%	8.28%
2000	12.45%	10.54%	10.58%	8.48%	11.12%	1.03%	9.44%	21.15%	8.24%	8.36%
2005	13.92%	11.95%	11.81%	9.80%	11.28%	1.10%	9.01%	20.86%	7.87%	10.12%

TRI-VALLEY AREA AS % OF ALAMEDA COUNTY

1980	14.5%	12.1%	14.7%	17.9%	9.5%	24.0%	6.2%	13.0%	11.4%	8.0%
1985	15.5%	13.3%	16.1%	19.9%	12.1%	25.6%	8.9%	14.8%	13.8%	11.1%
1990	18.5%	16.2%	19.3%	24.1%	17.1%	33.0%	13.1%	18.6%	20.1%	16.1%
1995	20.1%	17.5%	20.6%	25.6%	19.0%	37.3%	14.7%	21.5%	23.8%	16.0%
2000	21.5%	19.0%	22.0%	27.5%	21.7%	42.5%	20.2%	25.0%	26.2%	16.1%
2005	23.0%	20.5%	23.6%	29.4%	23.5%	50.0%	21.8%	27.6%	27.6%	17.9%

ALAMEDA COUNTY AS % OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

1980	21.3%	21.6%	20.5%	19.4%	20.2%	12.1%	19.2%	20.8%	21.3%	19.9%
1985	21.5%	21.6%	20.4%	18.8%	20.3%	11.5%	19.6%	21.6%	20.7%	20.1%
1990	21.4%	21.5%	20.5%	18.7%	20.3%	9.7%	20.8%	21.9%	19.4%	20.1%
1995	21.1%	21.2%	20.7%	18.7%	20.2%	8.5%	21.2%	21.3%	18.9%	20.6%
2000	21.0%	21.1%	20.7%	18.5%	20.0%	7.6%	21.1%	20.1%	18.8%	20.7%
2005	21.1%	21.2%	20.8%	18.4%	19.6%	6.6%	21.2%	19.5%	18.3%	20.3%

Sources: see Table 1.

File Ref: \Prj.Tools\ABAG\ABAG 4 2/12/90 page 3

PROJECTIONS: PER HOUSEHOLD & EMPLOYMENT RATIOS
City of Dublin, Tri-Valley, Alameda County, San Francisco Bay Region
1980-2005

Year	Population /Household	Employed Residents /Household	Average Household Income	Jobs Per Employed Residents	Jobs in Area Per 100 Households					
					Total Employ.	Agri. & Mining	Mfg. & Wholesale	Retail Trade	Services	Other Jobs
CITY OF DUBLIN										
1980	3.788	1.609	\$44,942	1.257	202	1	30	79	39	54
1985	3.667	1.667	\$46,600	1.205	201	1	29	88	34	49
1990	3.592	1.690	\$49,100	1.018	172	0	31	72	34	35
1995	3.483	1.653	\$50,100	1.086	180	0	34	68	47	31
2000	3.391	1.600	\$52,600	1.022	163	0	31	63	43	26
2005	3.302	1.551	\$55,200	0.947	147	0	27	56	35	28
TRI-VALLEY CITIES + ALAMO-BLACKHAWK										
1980	3.121	1.496	\$52,807	0.634	95	2	14	21	34	24
1985	3.074	1.544	\$56,337	0.730	113	2	19	24	38	30
1990	2.964	1.570	\$59,646	0.854	134	1	24	27	46	36
1995	2.932	1.597	\$62,820	0.906	145	1	27	30	52	35
2000	2.870	1.594	\$65,375	0.972	155	1	35	32	55	33
2005	2.833	1.569	\$67,314	0.992	156	1	36	32	53	33
ALAMEDA COUNTY										
1980	2.594	1.225	\$35,609	0.979	120	1	28	19	36	36
1985	2.637	1.283	\$37,800	0.966	124	1	28	22	37	36
1990	2.587	1.317	\$40,100	0.961	127	1	29	23	37	36
1995	2.562	1.361	\$43,000	0.979	133	1	32	25	38	38
2000	2.536	1.375	\$45,100	0.984	135	0	33	24	40	39
2005	2.524	1.361	\$46,900	0.997	136	0	34	24	40	38
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION										
1980	2.629	1.296	\$39,736	0.993	129	2	31	20	36	39
1985	2.642	1.355	\$43,300	0.971	132	2	31	22	38	39
1990	2.605	1.385	\$46,200	0.972	135	1	30	23	41	39
1995	2.573	1.399	\$48,900	1.000	140	1	32	25	43	39
2000	2.547	1.399	\$51,500	1.021	143	1	33	25	44	39
2005	2.525	1.386	\$53,900	1.054	146	1	34	26	46	40

Sources: see Table 1.
File Ref: \Prj.Tools\ABAG\ABAG 4 2/12/90 page 4

AVERAGE ANNUAL CHANGES IN PER HOUSEHOLD & EMPLOYMENT RATIOS
City of Dublin, Tri-Valley, Alameda County, San Francisco Bay Region
1980-2005

Year	Population /Household	Employed Residents /Household	Average Household Income	Jobs Per Employed Residents	Total Emplov.	Agri. & Mining	Mfg. & Wholesale	Retail Trade	Services	Other Employ.
------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------	---------------------	-----------------	----------	------------------

CITY OF DUBLIN
Average Annual Change ... 5 Year Periods

1980-85	3.024	1.975	\$55,400	0.979	193	(2)	23	139	10	24
1985-90	3.435	1.739	\$54,317	0.643	112	(1)	37	38	33	4
1990-95	2.920	1.460	\$55,282	1.500	219	0	45	46	116	12
1995-00	3.077	1.417	\$61,173	0.763	108	0	23	48	27	9
2000-05	2.984	1.377	\$64,526	0.638	88	0	13	32	8	35

% Change ... 1980 to 2005

1980-05	(13%)	(4%)	23%	(25%)	(27%)	(94%)	(8%)	(28%)	(10%)	(48%)
---------	-------	------	-----	-------	-------	-------	------	-------	-------	-------

TRI-VALLEY CITIES + ALAMO-BLACKHAWK
Average Annual Change ... 5 Year Periods

1980-85	2.800	1.825	\$76,870	1.183	216	(1)	46	42	64	65
1985-90	2.619	1.649	\$69,981	1.218	201	0	38	36	72	54
1990-95	2.712	1.785	\$84,686	1.221	218	0	47	52	92	27
1995-00	2.433	1.570	\$83,633	1.453	228	0	95	41	73	19
2000-05	2.541	1.379	\$82,399	1.171	162	0	46	38	43	36

% Change ... 1980 to 2005

1980-05	(9%)	5%	27%	56%	64%	(65%)	154%	54%	59%	38%
---------	------	----	-----	-----	-----	-------	------	-----	-----	-----

ALAMEDA COUNTY
Average Annual Change ... 5 Year Periods

1980-85	3.355	2.235	\$74,187	0.848	190	(3)	41	61	56	35
1985-90	2.021	1.708	\$66,167	0.919	157	(2)	38	43	43	35
1990-95	2.107	2.132	\$94,081	1.173	250	(2)	75	44	57	75
1995-00	2.054	1.633	\$84,344	1.066	174	(2)	54	12	63	46
2000-05	2.259	1.056	\$86,150	1.370	145	(2)	60	23	39	24

% Change ... 1980 to 2005

1980-05	(3%)	11%	32%	2%	13%	(71%)	23%	23%	11%	5%
---------	------	-----	-----	----	-----	-------	-----	-----	-----	----

SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION
Average Annual Change ... 5 Year Periods

1980-85	2.854	2.291	\$99,310	0.776	178	(4)	33	45	72	31
1985-90	2.197	1.715	\$78,507	0.976	167	0	18	38	75	37
1990-95	2.114	1.593	\$87,046	1.342	214	(1)	52	46	68	49
1995-00	2.123	1.408	\$93,981	1.362	192	(1)	51	36	66	40
2000-05	2.007	1.087	\$110,139	2.061	224	(2)	60	43	80	44

% Change ... 1980 to 2005

1980-05	(4%)	7%	36%	6%	14%	(48%)	9%	28%	27%	1%
---------	------	----	-----	----	-----	-------	----	-----	-----	----

Sources: see Table 1.

File Ref: \Prj.Tools\ABAG\ABAG 4 2/12/90 page 5

PROJECTIONS: PER HOUSEHOLD & EMPLOYMENT RATIOS ... % OF LARGER AREA
City of Dublin, Tri-Valley, Alameda County, San Francisco Bay Region
1980-2005

Year	Population /Household	Employed Residents /Household	Average Household Income	Jobs Per Employed Residents	Total Employ.	Agri. & Mining	Mfg. & Wholesale	Retail Trade	Services	Other Employ.
------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------	---------------------	-----------------	----------	------------------

CITY OF DUBLIN AS % OF TRI-VALLEY AREA

1980	121%	108%	85%	198%	213%	59%	208%	375%	116%	225%
1985	119%	108%	83%	165%	178%	50%	151%	366%	90%	164%
1990	121%	108%	82%	119%	128%	10%	133%	266%	73%	97%
1995	119%	103%	80%	120%	124%	10%	127%	224%	91%	89%
2000	118%	100%	80%	105%	105%	10%	90%	201%	78%	79%
2005	117%	99%	82%	95%	94%	9%	75%	175%	66%	85%

TRI-VALLEY AREA AS % OF ALAMEDA COUNTY

1980	120%	122%	148%	65%	79%	199%	51%	108%	94%	66%
1985	117%	120%	149%	76%	91%	192%	67%	111%	103%	83%
1990	115%	119%	149%	89%	106%	204%	81%	115%	124%	99%
1995	114%	117%	146%	93%	109%	213%	84%	123%	136%	91%
2000	113%	116%	145%	99%	115%	224%	107%	132%	138%	85%
2005	112%	115%	144%	99%	115%	244%	106%	135%	135%	87%

ALAMEDA COUNTY AS % OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

1980	99%	95%	90%	99%	93%	56%	89%	96%	99%	92%
1985	100%	95%	87%	99%	94%	53%	91%	100%	96%	93%
1990	99%	95%	87%	99%	94%	45%	97%	102%	90%	93%
1995	100%	97%	88%	98%	95%	40%	100%	100%	89%	97%
2000	100%	98%	88%	96%	95%	36%	100%	95%	89%	98%
2005	100%	98%	87%	95%	93%	31%	100%	92%	86%	96%

Sources: see Table 1.

File Ref: \Prj.Tools\ABAG\ABAG 4 2/12/90 page 6

APPENDIX C

SITES FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT MAP



Sites for Housing Development

February, 1985

APPENDIX D

RECENT RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS MAP

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C124907218